

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXII

JANUARY, 1940

NUMBER 1

BENEATH OUR DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES—A SPIRITUAL IMPULSE?

By DONALD B. ALDRICH,

Church of the Ascension, New York City

It was no accident which drove men to America. There is nothing purely fortuitous in the desire for "enlightened freedom." On the occasion when Thomas Paine vehemently called us to remember that our heritage is not solely English but continental as well and pleaded that we maintain a place of refuge for the oppressed of Europe; when, almost a generation earlier, angry colonists demanded of the crown not separation but the enjoyment of such freedom as belonged to Englishmen at home; when Washington tried to steer a safe course between Hamilton's desire to concentrate authority and Jefferson's belief in dispersing it—this "spirit of America" was no legally formulated thing such as later took shape in a constitution and a congress and a court. It was one more uprush of that irrepressible "Quelle" at the core of human personality which, like a spring in the winter's woods, murmurs underground until it somewhere breaks through its elemental crust to reflect the light it is seeking. It was an expression of that same spirit which we were taught as youngsters on Thanksgiving Day and Fourth of July when we

were told that our fathers sought a land where they could worship God as they pleased. If the phrase had become hackneyed and stale, there is within it a real fountain of faith which still runs free. In short, our belief does take form in social behavior and in political growth. Our "dependable democratic processes" are but the expression of a man's intuitive feeling that he is a part of a developing "culture." For our background provides us with no mean blend of French, Dutch, Italian, Swedish, German, and English influences. If culture implies anything, it implies a sense of having a history and having a philosophy about it, an idea of why one's nation came to be and where it is going. This consciousness on the part of some of us is really but a sense of "enlightened freedom"—the result of generations of individuals seeking, discovering, and vindicating inalienable rights, rights no less real if suggestive of things spiritual. Such discovery, such formulation, such realization of natural rights look in retrospect like destiny.

Men today are not wholly lacking in this healthy sense of destiny if destiny be not defined as "arrival" in *Who's Who* but is known through this apprehension that life leads somewhere if we give to it a more unreserved trust and thereby earn some sense of being led. Such a conviction is not merely a cultism or an awareness confined to the mystic. Any father who looks at his son in college during senior year and sees his lad become a significant person in his own right as he follows his own lead believes that this son has achieved just this inalienable right to "participate in the great heritage of enlightened freedom." Moreover, he may be convinced that his lad's birthright rests in something as inalienable and old-fashioned as to be called a soul and that this America should offer him a proving ground for this, his soul's inherent worth.

Again, just as it is no accident that we are a nation under God, so it is not accidental but an integral and inseparable part of our natural growth that democratic processes should have been the solvent for repeated social upheavals in our national life. Demo-

cratic processes are but the social expression of that which is intrinsically individual and the "growing pains" by which a democracy must gain its maturity. On this score, how the mere word "socialism" frightened us fifteen years ago when even radicals in parlors were held suspect! Through our democratic processes, however, these turbulent spirits in our national life have been gradually assimilated and little scar tissue remains. In like fashion we feared communism, dreaded an epidemic which should spread its red rash in the body politic. Our healthy democratic processes, however, have held this menace at least in abeyance and in many quarters are winning it to a faith in a less material way out. On the other hand, we may well today regard class fascism in our country with healthy disfavor especially when it cloaks itself as a protector for the class which advocates it. Any oppression of the free spirit of man raises doubt as to the inherent and destined power of our tried democratic processes. "I am sure," said Washington in 1784, "if this country is preserved in tranquillity twenty years longer, it may bid defiance in a just cause to any power whatever." Congress had less faith. It pushed through sedition laws, but it did so only to find the guiding genius of democracy—that inalienable right of every man to speak out of an enlightened freedom—was then, as it is now, the safest bulwark against this country's disintegration and overthrow.

The natural thing would be to see in this impulse for democracy a parallel to the aspiration of the human soul for God or to man's persistent quest for a spiritual authority, men being, as someone has said, incurably religious. But instead of regarding this impulse of the democratic processes as a parallel or analogy, suppose we think of it as just one more manifestation of what is genuinely spiritual. This feeling for "enlightened freedom" is more a matter of religious faith than some of us may admit. "Long may our land be bright with freedom's *holy* light," we may still sing during these present days when, in one more stage in man's history, church worship is often dull, and church religion may not

be too sure of its God, and many grope wistfully for an authority which has some say with one's soul. It would be unsafe surely to identify the natural spirit of man with the God in whom we trust, but we can safely believe that the human spirit is not expatriate in life and that it has an Ambassador at the Court of the Soul's Foreign Affairs. It may be that the democratic processes within the life of the nation are really the intended expression of those spiritual processes which are inherent in the soul of every man.

Here one ought not to attempt to make a case for religion, nor ought one to read into what is commonly called the secular, that which is not there. Yet our natural heritage is basically a religious heritage. The religion of our land (whether it be the Christian religion or the Hebrew faith out of which the Christian religion sprung) is irrevocably identified with personality and the sanctity of the individual. Under no true interpretation of these religions can a man ever be anything other than an end in himself. Moreover, the human soul has attachments to a "beyond" whether it be conceived as an old-fashioned territorial heaven or as some world which takes off from the horizon of man's best qualitative attainment here. As such a being, he can never be subordinated to a State which arbitrarily governs him but must contribute his own sovereign powers of personality to a system of government which is the free choice of the governed. It is only thus that government can be under God. Such government expresses in its democratic processes the recognition of man's corporate spiritual instincts and up teachings, moulded and shaped by each man's admission of the inalienable spiritual welfare of the man beside him. This is not to put personality on a pedestal and to give it worship. It is to be biologically progressive and not retrograde. For the highest we know is the qualitative in man, and when he is regarded as a commodity in bulk to be packed and labeled for a state's consumption he has either sold his birthright or had it fleeced from him.

One does not have to be technically religious to see that personality (the qualitative capacities of a person) appears to be

life's ultimate aim. The reasoning which may lead to this conclusion is fairly familiar. Although no man has seen the Creator at any time, no intelligent person can fail to believe in the existence of God. The very "Mystery of the Mind's Desire," the restless pursuit of the elusive secret of the order and niceness, the balance and beauty of an enchanting universe reveals the creativeness of that which we creatures pursue. Further, a Creator implies a purpose. We rarely make anything without having some reason for it. Not long ago, however, I was pressing this point a trifle too vehemently to a group of lads in a preparatory school. One boy interrupted, "Not at all, sir, sometimes we just whittle." We came to a compromise in a conception of a God who may have enjoyed creating a universe for the sheer pleasure of making it, leaving it to us to be more soberly purposeful. It was George Saintsbury who said that some of us cannot conceive Apollo without the bent bow. The result of the Creator's pleasurable purpose is obviously people, while the most significant fact about people is the intangible qualitative something within them called personality. Finally that which makes a person significant is his capacity to forget himself "for the sake of" something he holds of greater value and longer worth. A sound biological view of life must then have some perspective and philosophy in it and see the accruing values in the developing order of things. A supposedly intelligent outlook on life cannot surely see only a stack of catalogued recorded facts and no truth on the top of the pile. It would appear to a thoughtful observer as though the world must be worth something to the Creator. Now when man's developing spiritual processes lead him to the point where he can forget himself, he finds life and his world and the people of his country of worth in their own right and is bound to relate those inalienable rights to destiny and with the Creator's Supreme Desire.

Being finite, we human beings think of a Creator and a Finisher, of beginnings and endings. An infinite Creator, however, is now confined by Time. He makes us not only out of the materials which he has, but also out of the Spirit which he is, which

is qualitative and timeless and, for the aspiring Christian, Christ-like. As such, He is not less a Creator if He is better known to us as a Being of personal processes and identified with the spiritual impulse within our democratic processes, an Impulse and a Spirit of which we ever will be a part in our time and in His Eternity.

THE PERMANENT SIGNIFICANCE OF EVANGELICALISM IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

By ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE,

Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria *

Mr. President:

It is a very great honor to have been invited to deliver the Convocation address today. I realize that it was not intended to honor me individually, but rather an institution which has much in common with Bexley Hall and which I have the privilege of representing. As a representative of the Virginia Seminary, I bring you her greetings, and on her behalf wish you God-speed for the days ahead.

Both Bexley Hall and the Virginia Seminary are products of the Evangelical Movement in the Episcopal Church and were founded to propagate it by training clergymen in its views. Furthermore, several outstanding personalities have been powerful influences in both places. To mention but two: Dr. Sparrow, who left so little in writing that it is almost impossible justly to appraise him today though some of his students and contemporaries ranked him as the most powerful American theologian after Edwards, was a professor first with you and then with us, and in both places was the dominant influence during his incumbency; Charles P. McIlvaine was first a student at Virginia and during his rectorship in Georgetown a lecturer there, and later as Bishop of Ohio, President and lecturer at Bexley.

I have no intention today of talking in detail about your great founding fathers, Chase and McIlvaine, for that would be to bring coals to Newcastle. Nor shall I tell again the story of the Evangelical Movement. That would take far too long, and

* Address delivered at the centennial of the laying of the cornerstone of Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio, October 23, 1939.

you are familiar with it already. Rather, at the risk of being charged with presumption for attempting such a thing, I would consider with you the permanent significance of the Evangelical tradition which our two institutions represent.

I

One of the commonest ways in which movements of vital force lose their creative power is by having a large part of their energies diverted from the proclamation and embodiment of their great ideas to the denunciation of those who disagree with them. Now, no political movement can endure permanently on negatives, still less a cultural one, least of all a religious one.

The great misfortune of Evangelicalism in the Anglican Communion is that it became to a large extent a negative movement. From roughly 1840 onwards, it was defined in the popular mind—worse still, many of its adherents defined it in their own minds—in terms of opposition to the High Church view on the one hand, and on the other to the new studies in Biblical and Historical Criticism, Comparative Religions and Natural Science. If time permitted it would not be difficult to show why and how this occurred.

I call this the great misfortune of Anglican Evangelicalism for two reasons. In the first place, its real enemies with whom there could be no compromise were not these new nineteenth century developments but others whom the early Evangelical fathers used to call the Socinians and Antinomians.

In the second, the Evangelical emphasis is in reality no negative thing at all. It began as an experience and developed a platform. It is significant that every man who tries to write the history of the Evangelical Movement has to begin with a series of biographies, telling the story of how men like Grimshaw, Venn and Simeon in England, Moore, McIlvaine and Polk in America, were converted, what they did as a consequence of their conversion, and what results issued from their efforts. It will continue to be of significance so long as the experience is repeated and the platform cogently proclaimed.

The experience was an overwhelming realization of the inescapable sovereignty and love of God. Men found themselves living in a new world when they were awakened to the fact that people stand at all times and under all circumstances in the presence of God; that quite apart from whether they like it or even realize it, their conduct and their motives are always under the scrutiny of the Sovereign of the universe and that they are responsible to Him for what they do and say and think; that though they deserve to be condemned for their sins, yet of His incomprehensible mercy He is always offering them His forgiveness and the companioning presence of the Holy Spirit, with His gifts of cleansing, strength and consolation; that God—His constant presence and sovereignty, His judgment and redeeming love, historically revealed in the person of Jesus, ever pressing upon men's minds and consciences in the person of the Holy Spirit—is the central fact of life, the only fact of ultimate importance. The Evangelical emphasis became a powerful force in the Episcopal Church when God broke into the lives of a few men and women so startlingly that thenceforward they could not but live with reference to Him alone, could not but proclaim to all men everywhere, at whatsoever cost to themselves. "*This is the day of the Lord,*" and try to persuade them to lay hold on the salvation so graciously extended.

This overwhelming sense that the God of immeasurable power and unlimited love was constantly pressing upon the lives of all men everywhere with "deliberate speed, majestic instancy" was the primary experience. In the course of time men who had been thus apprehended developed a considerable body of particular beliefs and practices which can be summarized in the three tremendous assertions that I venture to call the evangelical platform: (1) That in the Bible there is a divinely inspired and altogether trustworthy revelation of the nature and will of God and of the dignity, danger and destiny of man; (2) That human life *apart* from God is worse than futile but that *under* God it has possibilities exceeding men's fondest dreams; (3) That in their efforts to obey the will of God Christians, both individually

and collectively, ought to be vigorously and ingeniously empirical. Since we are commemorating the centennial of an American institution I shall draw my illustrations of this "platform" from three American Evangelicals—Meade of Virginia, McIlvaine of Ohio and Muhlenberg of New York. I freely admit that the last is one of those rare creative geniuses whom it is dangerous to classify. Yet I would insist that he truly represented the Evangelical emphasis, in no way more strikingly than in adapting and re-expressing it as his times demanded.

II

The Evangelicals proclaimed unwearyingly that in the Bible there is a divinely inspired and completely trustworthy revelation of the nature and will of God and of the dignity, danger and destiny of man. A revelation of God's will, is, of course, a revelation of the way man must live.

Men persuaded of the inescapableness of God had to be sure about His nature and will. Meade argued in *The Bible and the Classics* that no man could *discover* the nature and will of God: the Unknown Almighty had to declare Himself if men were to know Him. The Bible claimed to contain an authentic account of God's revelation in the history of the Jews, the career and teachings of Jesus which gave the key by which everything else must be interpreted, the adventures of the apostolic church. Either it was thoroughly trustworthy, or else men were still groping in the darkness of error and illusion as much as the pagans of old. Obviously its trustworthiness depended on its inspiration. If it were the record of great human thinking and aspiring, there was no assurance that it interpreted God's nature and will more adequately than any other document of unusual human insight. It was thoroughly trustworthy and provided men with certainty about the ultimate questions only if the authors had been inspired by God's Spirit to write down the acts by which God had made Himself known. Furthermore, if it were a trustworthy and inspired revelation men had no choice but to obey its commands.

They could not select what they liked and reject what displeased them. Obedience to God's commands meant life and salvation; disobedience, or obedience only to what met the approval of men's fallible human judgment, meant death and damnation.

Since men could know how to obey the Sovereign God and appropriate His saving grace only if the Bible were trustworthy, and since its trustworthiness depended on its being divinely inspired, the doctrine of Biblical inspiration became a matter of life and death. McIlvaine grappled more than the earlier Evangelicals with the problems raised by this doctrine. In a pamphlet written to combat the volume *Essays and Reviews*, he argued that the logical conclusion of its views was a position analogous to that of the French rationalists of the 18th century and the German rationalists of the 19th. Rationalism and Christianity, he went on, are incompatible. So far we agree. But he, as practically all his contemporaries, was misled into holding that *infallible verbal* inspiration was necessary. He and the Evangelicals who came after him thought that the new Biblical criticism and the new natural science undermined all the Bible's trustworthiness, whereas in fact these disciplines enable men better to understand its great central message. They engaged in mortal combat with what were really their allies, to the great loss of both. For, as a result, much Biblical criticism and natural science lost all deep religious concern for a time, and Evangelicalism was bound to a false or inadequate understanding of the Bible and the facts of nature, and was decreasingly effective against the irreconcilable enemies of the Christian faith.

Few will question today the need of the Evangelical stress on the Bible as a revelation of God's nature and will and of man; and also few will question the need of emphasizing it in such fashion as to appropriate all the gains made by scholars during the last century in understanding its contents and teaching; and also in such fashion as to be convincing to men trained in twentieth century modes of thought and facing twentieth century problems.

III

Men in whose lives God had become the central fact were convinced from experience that life *apart* from Him is worse than futile while life *under* Him has such possibilities as exceed the fondest dreams. The Bible, and reflection upon history and contemporary events, led to the same conclusion. The different theological doctrines they stressed, when taken together, say just this.

Life apart from God is worse than futile: that is what was involved in their doctrines of original sin and depravity. In the first place they thought that the dominant traits of human nature are self-centredness and aggressiveness. The Bible portrayed this from the stories of the Fall and the Tower of Babel to the description of Rome in the Apocalypse. And what was proclaimed in the Bible was vindicated by history and by men's knowledge of their own souls. Furthermore, self-centredness and aggressiveness sooner or later led to envy, strife, war destruction. There was no chance that man by his own unaided efforts could work out a just and perfect society, for his reason and tolerance always gave way to passion and bigotry when what he deemed vital interests were at stake. His noblest dreams and efforts were doomed by this basic fact of his nature. All his efforts for a better world were sure to be frustrated unless those innate traits were somehow overcome. He could not overcome them by himself for they were part of him. Only God could do it.

In this connection it is interesting to note that, to the best of my knowledge, none of the early Evangelical leaders were Jeffersonians. They feared his political philosophy because they were suspicious of anything connected with godless French republicanism, and to their mind republicanism could never be other than godless. But I suspect that they parted company with him chiefly because they thought his political system could not work on account of being based on a too optimistic view of human nature.

In the second place, the Evangelicals thought that these destructive traits in human nature were due to an historic event called the Fall, as a result of which Adam transmitted to the human race what Meade called "the deadly poison," a bent of character that so blurred even men's highest vision that they could not grasp or obey God's will. They were at cross-purposes with their Maker from birth. They were as incapable of fulfilling His demands and winning eternal life as a man with paralysis is incapable of making his limbs function normally. Their inevitable lot was not merely frustration and futility in this life but eternal damnation as the enemies of God. In one of his sermons Meade said to his hearers, "Let me beg you to remember that you are at this moment under sentence of eternal death." And frequently he addressed his congregation as "My dear perishing friends."

This conviction that people were in terrible peril because they did not obey their Sovereign God, and would surely perish unless they were converted from their ignorance and indifference, was one of the main causes of the desperate urgency in the Evangelicals' preaching.

Man's life is worse than futile apart from God. We may doubt that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ will angrily punish those who become involved in the sin of humanity through no conscious choice but in spite of sincere efforts to obey their noblest insights; we may resolutely avoid the words "original sin"—as I do—because those words are almost universally misunderstood; we may not regard the Fall as a specific event in history; we may not picture Hell in the same fashion as did the early Evangelicals; but surely we agree that the human race *left to itself* is doomed to frustration by reason of its innate pride and aggressiveness, and that men and women have consciously or unconsciously so transgressed the will of the Creator and Sovereign of this universe, upon Whom they are altogether dependent, as to forfeit any *claim* on His blessings and eternal life.

But life *under* God has possibilities exceeding men's fondest dreams. That faith was stated in their doctrines of the Atonement and Justification by Faith, of the sanctification and the

fellowship of believers wrought by the Holy Spirit, of eternal life. It was because they proclaimed this faith with such convincing power that the Evangelical preaching came as a triumphant message of hope to under privileged and blasé alike.

The outlines of the doctrines are familiar to you all. As a result of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross men were freed from the domination of sin and eternal death, and God was enabled to forgive them their past without jeopardizing the justice of his rule. Of course the benefits of Christ's death had to be appropriated by the individual. The sole means of appropriating them was faith. But faith had to issue in obedience to God's will. Strenuous efforts to obey were both the result and the sign of faith. Conversion, the individual's conscious decision to enthrone Christ as the Sovereign over every sphere of life, was the crucial point in existence. To trust and obey Him was a matter of choice, and that choice was the most important thing in a person's career. To those who trusted and tried to obey, the Holy Spirit was given. He changed them in character and understanding; He united them to their fellow-believers in a fellowship so significant as to beggar comparison. The crown of the faithful believer was Eternal Life both here and hereafter. Such, in substance, was their interpretation of the Biblical teaching. Several things must be said about it.

First, we must admit certain limitations. The early Evangelicals' formulation of the doctrine of the Atonement may be impossible for us. And we may think that they laid an altogether one-sided emphasis on the Cross, minimizing the importance of the doctrine of the Incarnation. However, we must remember that McIlvaine brought the two into much better balance than his predecessors. His words to a group of preachers are worth quoting. "In setting forth the Lamb of God in his death as a sacrifice, you must also set him forth in his life as an example 'without blemish and without spot.' There is too little preaching of 'the mind that was in Christ Jesus.' It was his preparation for the sacrifice." Muhlenberg and later Evangelicals went a step

further in insisting that apart from the Resurrection the Cross was a symbol of despair rather than of hope.

But while granting the inadequacies of their formulations, we insist that the Evangelicals' faith that the massed powers of sin had been met and overcome when Christ died on the Cross without yielding to its temptations or torments, and that God had vindicated Him by the Resurrection, is the very heart of Christianity. For it means that the power which frustrates man and sets him in opposition to God has been vanquished in principle. If I may be permitted a military analogy, the Cross and Resurrection were like the Battle of Saratoga which in the judgment of most historians was the turning point of the Revolution. There remained several campaigns and vast hardships for the Americans after that engagement, but the enemy's supremacy had been broken there and all that followed was the result of that victory. So there remained (and still remain) much conflict and suffering for the faithful after Calvary, but on that Hill the undisputed control of evil was broken and all subsequent human victories over evil are the working out of the consequences of that Cross. Further, the gift of the Spirit means that by His help men can link their efforts to the eternal purposes of God which someday will prevail. Those efforts, then, are no longer doomed to frustration but resemble the apparently futile sacrifices of many Colonials between Saratoga and Yorktown. Those who trust and strive valiantly at whatsoever cost—such as the agony of the persecuted Christians of Russia or Germany—have a share in the Kingdom of God. To the suffering and oppressed of our day, to those in Europe facing a war which may well destroy their civilization, to those in every land who despair because they can do nothing to avert the catastrophe, the Evangelical faith is still as it was to the men and women of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries "a trumpet blast from the hid battlements of eternity"; it makes them prisoners of hope.

Secondly, we must recall that it was the doctrine of Justification by Faith only which lay at the root of the Evangelicals' most serious controversies. In the early days they engaged two ad-

versaries. The first they dubbed Socinians—those who held that man could attain his goal by his own unaided efforts and consequently minimized or denied the importance of the divine redemption effected on Calvary; to whom they replied that they made God a liar, for He had testified differently in the Bible. The second they called the Antinomians—those who claimed that if a man had faith his morals were of negligible importance; to whom they answered that all the divine commands, those concerning morals and those concerning faith, were equally binding.

From 1840 onwards the Evangelicals fought the Tractarians over the same doctrine. It is essential to remember that that controversy did not turn primarily over a high view of the Church and the Sacraments. In point of fact, the early Evangelicals were High Churchmen. They held that the Church was a divine creation and no mere human organization, the Body of Christ, the new family of God, active membership in which was obligatory on all Christians. With respect to the ministry, McIlvaine argued in his sermon at Bishop Polk's consecration that the episcopate was of divine origin, that non-episcopal ministries were at the least irregular and partial. He would not however admit the deduction of the Tractarians that God's blessings were limited to those in union with an apostolic episcopate, for he held that to those who really trusted and tried to obey, God would grant forgiveness and His Holy Spirit. The ministers were the only official and authorized spokesmen of the Church; they only were competent to celebrate the Lord's Supper, to pronounce the absolution and benediction. "In pronouncing the benediction," wrote Simeon, "I do not do it as a mere finale; but I feel that I am actually dispensing God's peace at God's command. I do not know the individuals to whom my benediction is a blessing; but I know that I am the appointed instrument by whom God is conveying the blessing to those who are able to receive it." His American confreres agreed with his words. The two Sacraments they regarded as divinely ordained, and their use as obligatory. Baptism gave the baptized person a new status, the right and title to all the privileges of the New Covenant, though the benefits

thereof had to be appropriated by faith. The Lord's Supper was no mere memorial; it was a means of communing with the Lord who was really present; it was the feast of the family of Christ. Lastly, the rubrics and canons of the Church had to be obeyed. There never was a stricter disciplinarian than Meade. It was he who objected to the so-called High Churchmen of the day that they obeyed no bishop but the dead ones. In short, within the limits of Justification by Faith, and of the Bible as the test to which all reputed developments in Church dogma must be submitted, and of the Church as constituted by the believers rather than by the hierarchy or ministry, the latter being representatives and agents of the former, Evangelicalism was compatible with Catholicism. It is significant that Muhlenberg called himself an "Evangelical Catholic."

If a high view of the Church, ministry and sacraments was not the central point at issue between the Evangelicals and the Tractarians, still less was ceremonial. Both groups knew that ceremonial was of importance only for what it symbolized and taught.

In the eyes of the Evangelicals the dangers of "the Oxford divinity" was two-fold. First, the stress on the Fathers, the Councils and the later formulations of doctrine seemed to subordinate the Bible to them rather than vice versa. Secondly, the stress on Baptism, the Eucharist and the apostolic ministry seemed to make men's salvation turn on the observance of those ordinances rather than on God's free grace. Meade said the Tractarian Movement was making the mistake of the Jews, exalting means to an equality with ends. McIlvaine thought it a subtle revival of the heresy of justification by works and a nullification of the importance of the Cross. It was this controversy that caused him to reëxamine the Evangelicals' view of the Sacraments and Orders and made him their most important writer on these topics.

In the third place, because the Evangelicals were so convinced that in his unspeakable mercy God *had* acted to save men and that men's part was to accept a proffered gift rather than attempt the impossible task of *winning* eternal life, the notes of gratitude

and hope constantly rang through their writings and preaching. For all their austerity and their terrible sense of sin, they could not be gloomy as they are so often pictured. The General Thanksgiving was as much on their lips as the General Confession. They could not help rejoicing over all the blessings of this life, over the redemption of the world, over the means of grace and the hope of glory. The main Evangelical hymn writer was Dr. Muhlenberg, and his most characteristic hymn began

Shout the glad tidings, exultingly sing,
Jerusalem triumphs, Messiah is king.

If human life apart from God was worse than futile, human life under God had such possibilities as exceeded men's fondest dreams.

IV

That men for whom God had become the central fact of life should devote themselves with unsurpassed urgency to the effort to obey His will is not surprising. They had seen the King, the Lord of Hosts, and each man heard the commands addressed directly to himself: "*Thou* shalt proclaim the Gospel to every creature;" "*Thou* shalt serve the needs of thy brethren." They dared not disobey their Sovereign's commands whatever might be their inclinations. Weariness, discomfort, obloquy, death were of small moment in comparison with the fate of those who disobeyed God. Furthermore, their eyes had gazed upon the Cross and each man knew in his heart that "Christ died for *me*." The love of Christ constrained them. Better to suffer anything than to fail Him.

It was not merely humanitarian sympathy that drove the gently nurtured and physically delicate McIlvaine to endure the privations of the rude frontier area, with abominable roads and worse inns, which was Ohio when he first went there; that sent Boone and Williams to the Orient, Payne and Pennick to Africa; that led Muhlenberg into activities which made him suspect of nearly all his contemporary Churchmen. Purely human sympathy usu-

ally stops short of what those men and their colleagues endured. It was obedience to an Almighty Sovereign and gratitude to an all-loving Saviour that made them ready to risk everything in His service.

It would be for me a grateful undertaking to tell again the story of their labors and accomplishments. But that story is well known. So also is their understanding of God's will; that its main elements were Bible study and prayer, austere personal morality, philanthropy, doing one's duty as a citizen, evangelism at home and abroad. We remember gratefully today that, partly as a means of evangelism and partly as a measure of philanthropy, they were assiduous in founding schools, colleges and seminaries at home and on the mission field where boys should be taught the Christian verities and receive the training that would make them useful citizens in their several callings and be equipped to proclaim the Gospel. Kenyon is but one of their colleagues, albeit the outstanding one; Bexley Hall is but one of several seminaries they began.

What is not so well recognized is the vigorous and ingenious empiricism that marked the efforts of the early Evangelicals to obey God's will. We can illustrate this briefly from two fields of activity.

Take first the closely allied fields of evangelism and public worship. When the people could not or would not come to the churches, the Evangelicals went to the people with cottage meetings, barn meetings, open air meetings. I believe that in several Ohio towns Bishop Chase held his first services in the saloon. In a later day, Muhlenberg began the mid-day Lenten services in a New York theatre and the three-hour service on Good Friday. When people could not get to Communion Services in the morning, the Evangelicals held them in the afternoon or at night. They thought, you see, that whatever procedure was effective for winning people to Christ and helping them live in His obedience was right. All means were judged by their functional value. Tradition was less important than results. This applied to interdenominational enterprises like the American Bible Society.

Whereas Bishop Hobart forbade his New York communicants to belong to that society, Moore and Meade not only urged their people to support it but were themselves presidents of the Virginia branch. It applied even to the Prayer Book, to which they were of all men the most attached. Though they insisted uncompromisingly that at the stated services in the Church there must be no slightest deviation from its rubrics they were sure that there was need of quite other types of service at which the Prayer Book was not used at all. McIlvaine had such effect with his expository lectures and extempore prayers at West Point that he was accused of trying to turn a military academy into a theological seminary. Muhlenberg devised special forms to meet the needs of his boys at St. George's School, Flushing, and later, in his New York parish, to make better use of the Saints' days. Though they dissented vigorously from the changes in the Prayer Book Bishop Hobart desired to have made, the first effective movement for Prayer Book revision and enrichment dated from the famous Muhlenberg Memorial in 1853. Why was he so insistent on the need for changes? Near his parish in New York were large numbers of newly arrived immigrants. His parish supported a missionary among the trappers, cattle-men and new settlers in the Northwest. If it were to be useful to either group, the Prayer Book had to be translated into language intelligible to *them*.

That the early Evangelicals should judge all forms and methods by their functional value is not strange. Such things were not divine revelations but of human devising. Consequently, the test they must meet was their usefulness in helping men obey the divine command to make disciples of all the nations and to worship God in spirit and in truth.

The early Evangelicals were equally empirical in their approach to the work of philanthropy. Bishop Meade was opposed to slavery and while still a young man freed his own slaves and persuaded others to do the same. But he became dissatisfied. He saw that the lot of freed men was often worse than that of slaves. Some means must be found for giving them an opportunity to develop unhindered by the culture and economy of the whites.

So he became one of the most active leaders in that little band that laid the foundations of what is today the Republic of Liberia. Again, I know of no men anywhere who excelled the ingenuity that Dr. Muhlenberg displayed in devising new and more effective ways for ministering to the needs of people in Philadelphia, Lancaster, and New York. The incomparable story of the beginnings of the dispensary conducted by the Church of the Holy Communion and of St. Luke's Hospital, New York, is well known. Less well known is his work in starting fresh-air camps for slum children, in establishing the first sisterhood in the Episcopal Church so as to staff his dispensary and hospital, in educating his wealthier parishioners to the desperate poverty of some of their neighbors by taking members of his vestry with him on his parish calls.

None of these men cared if they violated the conventional way of doing things, or if they were accused of putting dangerous ideas into circulation. The social and ecclesiastical conservatism that characterized many later Evangelicals was wholly alien to them. If traditions and conventions got in their way when they were trying to help needy and suffering people, so much the worse for the conventions and traditions.

Two things ought to be borne in mind in connection with this empiricism. First, it was the intense urgency in the matters of evangelism and service that was responsible for one of the most conspicuous limitations of the Evangelicals, namely their failure to pay serious attention to the fields of scholarship and art. They had no time for such things. To be sure, if intellectual matters were hindering the spread of the Gospel they tried to deal with them—as Meade tried to deal with the problems raised by the comparative study of religions in his book, *The Bible and the Classics*, and as McIlvaine tried to deal with philosophic scepticism in his *Evidences of Christianity*. And if theological trends imperilled the purity of the Gospel they tried to set forth the true faith, as did McIlvaine in his defense of the inspiration of the Bible. But research and scholarship for their own sakes, art and aesthetics, science and economics, were so subordinate in impor-

tance to the salvation of souls and the care of the needy that they had to be left to one side. The consequences in the latter half of the 19th century were deplorable. For lack of investigation into the new knowledge the old faith became stereotyped into shibboleths instead of being born anew as a flaming passion, and the spirit of adventurous enquiry became suspect. And had some of them studied hard in economics and Church history, later generations of Evangelicals would have been less tempted to confine religion largely to matters of private conduct.

Secondly, it is worth noting that this empiricism was due in part to the great influence of the laity. We must ever remember that the Evangelicals thought Christianity was the life and work of a fellowship of men and women in which clergy had special functions but no domination, in which the laity had as much voice in determining policies and controlling institutions as had the clergy, and in which the laity had the paramount task of making the Gospel effective in the common life.

Evangelicalism in England and America was in principle anti-clericalist, and in practice succeeded in enlisting the active work of the laity to a degree unsurpassed by any other movement in the history of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. Now whereas clericalists tend to traditionalism and try to make people fit into the ancient modes of worship and procedure rather than adapting the forms to the needs of people in changed circumstances, men active in business or political affairs instinctively judge proposed courses of action or suggested changes in forms by their practical usefulness. The Evangelical laity thought themselves as responsible as the clergy for winning people to the Christian faith and life, and their concern was to have *effective* means for developing the character and activities of the converts.

To my mind, nothing in the Evangelical emphasis is more significant for today than this stress upon the laity. Christianity can never be a force except as the laity make it so. It is laymen who must make Christianity effective in government and business; for clergy fill no offices in these spheres, and have relatively little influence in the formation of governmental and business

policies. It is laymen and women who must bring American literature, education, and journalism under the overarching influence of the Christian understanding of life; for the vast majority of teachers and administrators, of writers and editors, are laymen and women. It is laymen who must bring the movies and amusements before the bar of Christian standards of morality and social usefulness, and who must make American homes centres of Christian faith. And in proportion as the voice of the laity is powerful in the councils of the Church, the Church will so act and speak as to be intelligible to the mass of unchurched men and women.

CONCLUSION

Evangelicalism has usually been regarded as a phenomenon which dates from the Reformation and its manifestation in the Anglican Communion has been identified with one particular party. It has been customary further to limit it to one particular theological and philosophical formulation of the Christian faith. This seems to me an error—as much an error as to identify Catholicism with Ultramontaniam. The more I try in my own mind to disentangle that which is primary and permanent in the contentions of its early great exponents in the Episcopal Church from that which was temporary and due to the immediate circumstances of their day, the more I become convinced that Evangelical Christianity is not limited to any one party in Anglicanism, nor to the Churches of the Reformation, nor to any one particular set of formularies. It is discernible in every age and in people of divers churchmanships. Within limits it is compatible with Catholicism and Protestantism, with orthodoxy and modernism, and is of overwhelming significance as the central strand that unifies very differing philosophical and theological formulations.

The present task of those who are heirs of this great tradition in Bexley and Alexandria is to proclaim its positive convictions in season and out, refusing to waste energies in controversies over secondary points with people who are equally involved in Christianity's struggle against the current paganisms, the pagan-

isms of totalitarianism and of many of the assumptions of so-called Americanism. Beyond proclaiming these convictions in words we must demonstrate them in action: by the practice of the presence of God; by making real the spirit of fellowship so evident in the early class-meetings where people supported one another both spiritually and materially; by trying to make our public worship increasingly creative; by working incessantly for reunion, without which Christianity cannot be effective; by striving for a social order in which there shall be less of the glaring injustice and exploitation that characterizes the one dying around us today; by straining every nerve to fulfill the command to make disciples of all men; by maintaining an ultimate optimism in the face of whatsoever immediate disasters, an optimism based not on obliviousness to the danger of large-scale catastrophe but on the unshakeable faith that the last word lies not with blind chance, ignorance or sin but with God. We are prisoners of hope because we believe that God is at once the loving Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the omnipotent Ancient of Days, who created the stars and for that He is mighty in power not one of them faileth, before Whom the isles are a very little thing and the princes of the earth as nothing.

THE NEW NATURALISM AND CHRISTIANITY

By RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER,

Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California

Two of the most important recent developments in Christian thinking have been neo-supernaturalism and the new theistic naturalism. The former stems directly from the Augustine-Calvin-Luther tradition. It is frankly supernatural in its metaphysics, epistemology, and concept of God. Its view of the natural world is that man and all his creatures are so debased as to be unworthy of consideration. Even the so-called "natural theology" is deemed of worth only in so far as it illustrates the utter uselessness of man's seeking God in his own right. Philosophy, empirical method, science, and other attempts at human knowledge demonstrate the futility of man's efforts to establish the revealed truth of Christianity.

1. *The New Naturalism.*—The new naturalism is the exact opposite of all this. It denies that there is any supernatural realm at all. Reality is to be conceived as a natural organism, inter-related in all its parts, so that all that exists is included in a vast set of connections. The history of this organism is best described, as far as this world is concerned, by the theory of "emergent evolution." The meaning of the natural world is understood in the terms of emergents of meaning and value in its temporal history. God is to be discovered by an examination of the data provided by observation of the natural world. Thus, natural theology is not only reinstated but becomes the final court of appeal for religious knowledge. An epistemology similar to that presupposed by the natural sciences is applied to the religious object, and the resulting concept of God represents a reality within the natural world.

The new naturalism has a vital religious outlook. Knowledge of God results from the impact of environment upon the human

organism. The organism reacts by a series of acts which organizes its behavior intelligently, and this leads to the discovery of patterns leading to predictable results. When these patterns have become sufficiently fixed to determine satisfactory outcomes, one has knowledge. This is the way all knowledge is obtained, including knowledge of God. Such knowledge is never merely subjective, whether it applies to God or an apple, because the only satisfactory conclusions must be related to the response of the environment to one's concepts.¹

The only knowledge we can have of anything comes from the relationship between organism and environment. The difference in degrees of knowledge among people is due to variations in natural capacities, opportunities, and ways of testing the results. The discoverer in any field develops his natural capacities of observation, appreciation, imagination, and experimental behavior far beyond those of his contemporaries, and this is what makes possible his discoveries. There is no distinction between the secular and religious genius, except that the latter is concerned with the impact of the whole of the environment upon his organism. Revelation, for the naturalist, is possible anywhere and anytime there is the proper relation between event and appreciation. It is the same as any other knowledge, except for its superior value. It is found and tested in the same way.

God is to be found in the natural world. The naturalist believes that God can be discovered at work in the world. By observation of what God *does*, one can infer that he is. Henry Nelson Wieman says that God is "the growth of meaning and value in the world." Bernard Eugene Meland calls him the "creative order" of the universe. He is the principle, process, and pattern of integration which is evident to all who observe the workings of nature, society, and the individual human organism. He is revealed as such to those who have eyes to see.

¹ Cf. Wieman-Horton, *Growth of Religion*, pp. 258-259. Among those who might be considered as "naturalists" are Henry Nelson Wieman, Bernard Eugene Meland, Edward Scribner Ames, Gerald Birney Smith, Harry A. Overstreet, Alfred N. Whitehead, William P. Montague, Harold A. Bosley, and others.

God is not identical with the natural world. There is no pantheism involved here. God is "wholly other" than the natural order, and yet he pervades the natural order. He is not identical with humanity, but he can be discovered working, and therefore present, in the hearts of men. God is superhuman, and transcends all that humanity may do of itself. As a "creative synthesis," he is the persuasive guide of all that is, and yet he is *other* without being beyond it. If the natural world is all that is, he cannot be supernatural, for the latter realm is non-existent.

The naturalist is much less certain about the nature of God than his more orthodox brethren. He claims to know very little about the nature of God. He says his concept of God is always only an "operational" idea which aids in fathoming the mystery of God's nature. As Wieman says, "God is always more than we can think." But the naturalist is equally sure that "God always is."

God is primarily known not for his relations with nature, but for his relations with men. It is in the connections between God and man that one finds most of the data for obtaining a concept of God. Wieman would accept the symbol that God is our "Father."² By this he means (1) that God is the creator of personality, (2) that men are brothers in his sight, and (3) that his love falls on all people. God as "growth" brings forth human personality, fosters, sustains, and promotes it, bringing it into a brotherhood of love. God's activities in the realm of human personality are attested by the evidence of the ages.

This, in brief, is naturalistic theism. Its essence is that men must live in absolute commitment to the will of God, and his will is discerned through a life of worship, sensitivity, and responsiveness that is always open to that will in each unique situation. Prayer simply is commitment to God, and this is the heart of religious living.

2. *Traditional Christianity*.—Traditional Christianity has always been frankly supernatural. If one may dare to state what

² *Ibid.*, pp. 364-365.

Christianity has been, it can be said that it has included belief in both a natural and supernatural world, in a supernatural revelation of God's will and nature to a chosen few, and in religious living based upon the acceptance of supernaturally given beliefs. There have been many variations of this formula, some denying one or more aspects of the main stream of thought; but *never* has any number of Christians conceived their religion in naturalistic terms. There have been many types of theistic metaphysics forming the background for a Christian world view, but all have allowed room for the supernatural. Knowledge of God has centered in the Bible and the Church, both of which have been conceived as supernaturally endowed. Individuals have also claimed to have revelations, and they have thought of them as supernatural in their source.

In contrast with the neo-supernaturalists, however, the main stream of Christian thought has always made room for the natural knowledge of man. Faith and reason have usually supplemented each other, with faith being superior. God is the end of all knowledge, whether it be natural or supernatural. The completion of this knowledge, however, has always centered in the supernatural revelation found in the Incarnation of Christ. For traditional Christianity, this has always been conceived as the supreme and final revelation of God. Any other attempt to know God must, in the nature of the case, fall far short of the revelation that is in Christ.

The new naturalism seems to be at odds with traditional Christianity from start to finish, for even when the naturalists accept the centrality of Christ they interpret his work on the basis of their naturalistic assumptions. The revelations of the historic Jesus are those of a supreme religious genius, and God was in Jesus reconciling the world to himself through the processes of natural and moral and spiritual law. Historically and naturally conceived, Jesus is central; but this leads to non-traditional interpretations of the elements in the life and death of Jesus which traditionalists call supernatural.

3. *As Naturalism Views Christianity.*—"A true Christian," says Wieman,³ "is distinguished by three marks. First, he is unconsciously shaped in his living by that historic past which centers in the figure of Jesus Christ. Second, he consciously turns to that past for all the insight and guidance he can find there, ordinarily requiring fellowship in a group who do likewise. Third, he carries the lore of this past—not only that part of it which he can appreciate in all the fullness of its significance, but the total body of it so far as the generations have sifted and conserved it."

Wieman believes that Christian living is definitely grounded in the past. Christians are bound by traditions, helpful and otherwise. At the same time, a Christian lives in the present. While part of an historic process, the Christian lives "at the growing edge of this historic continuum." But, says Wieman, granting that the Christian heritage is important, a person may accept all the things that make up Christian belief and character and not be truly and uniquely religious, unless he follows the religious way.

The religious way is the most precious thing in life, more precious even than any beliefs, traditions, or practices of Christianity. Thus, to be distinctively religious is "to live only 'for the will of God.' The will of God is the creative synthesis of each unique situation."⁴ One is absolutely committed to God.

For the naturalist, the Christian heritage is an aid to the religious way, but the religious way itself strikes deeper than any particular religion. It is centered at the very heart of man's experience of God, in the crisis of the unique moment. No tradition, no beliefs, and no fellowship can guarantee that the essence of religious living will be found. The whole of the Christian heritage is instrumental to the doing of God's will.

This is not meant as a condemnation of Christianity. Most of the naturalists have been reared in the Christian community, and they have not broken with that fellowship. This does not mean that those who call themselves Christian are not religious. It

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 281-282.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

only means the obvious fact that many conform to all the preachings, doctrines, and practices of the Christian community without ever becoming distinctively religious. They fail to take the final step that makes religion a way of life committed absolutely to God.

All naturalists do not agree with Wieman in his evaluation of Christianity. It is possible to accept Christianity naturalistically and empirically and still maintain that it is the most perfect expression of the religious way, provided its full implications are comprehended and accepted. Christianity at its best involves absolute commitment to a God of love, and whenever it fails to demand this it fails in its primary purpose. Absolute commitment to God provides the norm for evaluating all Christian living.

4. *Christianity's Attitude Toward Naturalism.*—Those who hold to the position of traditional Christianity may take one of three attitudes toward the new naturalism: (a) the new naturalism is the antithesis of Christianity; (b) it is a temporary expedient for presenting essential Christian truths to this age; or (c) it is *logically* prior to Christianity, and serves as a philosophical foundation for the reinterpretation of Christian beliefs.

(a) Proponents of the first position insist on the supernatural origin of Christianity. They say that the revelation of God in the Bible, in Christ, and in the Church is the heart of all true religion. By the use of reason we may test and communicate the supernatural truths of Christianity, but faith is superior to reason. Religious experience is valid only when it is the experience of the Christ of faith. The only salvation which Christianity teaches is the forgiveness of sins through the supernatural atonement of Christ on the cross, and this guarantees the saved eternal life. This is "foolishness" to all who do not have it.

The new naturalism is of no help. It does not protect the centrality and finality of either the Bible or the Christ. It has no place for the faith which supersedes reason. It stresses the religious value of all experience, instead of emphasizing the centrality of the experience of the saving grace of Christ. It teaches that salvation is possible apart from faith in Christ and the cross.

It denies the heart of the Christian faith when it fails to interpret the death and resurrection of Christ as the hub of the universe, around which all meaning moves. It does not accept the concept of God revealed in Jesus Christ as authoritative, but goes back to one's own experience and history as the final grounds of truth.

There are also certain psychological reasons for the rejection of the new naturalism. Naturalism does not pretend to speak with the voice of authority, but admits that its concept of God is a tentative and instrumental one. It rejects the certainty which has been the bulwark of dogmatic Christianity. It is psychologically impossible for most religious people to combine the attitude of tentativeness with absolute commitment to God. Also, in rejecting authority, the shadow of doubt is cast on both Bible and Church. Instead of two great immovable stones of authority and certainty, the new naturalism has only two helpful and relative reference points for religious living. Many Christians find this psychologically inadequate.

The whole approach of naturalism, then, is foreign to Christianity according to this line of reasoning. Naturalism rejects both certainty and authority, even in the Bible and the Church. It puts the finger of doubt upon traditional interpretations of the atonement and incarnation. By its rejection of supernatural revelation, it seems to substitute mere human concepts for divinely given truths.

(b) A second interpretation is that naturalism is only to be understood in the light of the Christian position and tradition. Instead of being opposed to Christianity the new naturalism is a temporary expedient for adapting the Christian message to a new age. While many errors are contained in its teaching, its chief purpose is to make clear the Christian message in the language and thoughts of today. Any study of the history of Christian thought indicates clearly that Christian theology has been forced to readapt itself to successive stages of culture in order to be intelligible.

People who hold this position insist on the central truths of traditional Christianity, but they conceive the essence of Christianity

as a continuous growth, with Christ the chief cornerstone. As the Christian message spread, it adapted itself to the new philosophies and sciences, to the Greek, Roman, and Teutonic minds. In recent times, no one would claim that the religious thought of a Kant, a Schleiermacher, or a Ritschl is final or even inclusive of the whole Christian message. Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin, and Luther gave particular interpretations to Christianity which insured its progress into new ages. Such theologies are not complete or final, but they are instrumental to the understanding and practice of the Christian way to salvation.

The same thing can be claimed for the new naturalism. It is an attempt to present Christianity to an age which is able to think only in naturalistic terms, which sees life as an organic whole, and which cannot find meaning in many of the traditional and frankly supernatural concepts.

From this point of view, there is at least a charitable attitude toward the new naturalism. There are lingering doubts as to whether the naturalists are doing as able a job as Ritschl did for his age, because the naturalists claim so little about God that is hard to believe. Also, the naturalists use concepts which are difficult to correlate with traditional beliefs. The naturalists call themselves "theists." If "theism" means simply "belief in God," the words "naturalistic theism" have meaning. If, however, "theism" means belief in a transcendent-immanent, creator God with moral and personal attributes, then the naturalists have no right to the term. Are they not "religious naturalists" rather than "theistic naturalists"?

So while the naturalists may be accepted because they represent a temporary expedient in the communication of the essentially religious note of the Christian message, one must remain extremely critical of their results—as they themselves are critical. It is a valuable and necessary effort, but it is merely a means to an end. It is limited to the natural truths of Christianity, and fails to maintain its supernatural aspects.

(c) To evaluate the new naturalism either as the antithesis or as a temporary statement of Christianity and leave the matter

there is to miss the most important aspect of its contribution to modern religious thought. It also may be thought of as *logically prior to Christianity*, as philosophically necessary as natural theology has been to the thought of most traditional Christians.

The new naturalism is not specifically theology at all. It is a philosophical study of the phenomena of religious living. It is not specifically Christian because its scope is wide enough to include the minute examination of all types of religious living. For those who insist on the absoluteness of the Christian revelation, it may be thought of as a forerunner. At least, it serves as a philosophical basis upon which may be built the superstructure of Christian belief.

The new naturalism is primarily empirical. It believes that all knowledge comes from the analysis of experience and the rational inferences which may be made. If this be the way knowledge works, then we have an invaluable tool by which to examine all the discoveries of religious thinkers throughout the ages. Revelation is of no less value because it is also man's insight into the nature of God. God is no less present in man's daily living because we observe that God arouses one's latent energies.

This means that no matter what one claims for his Christianity, it may be analyzed by the instruments of naturalism. Even Barthianism, with its radical disjunction between natural and supernatural, may be understood as a *natural* phenomenon. A Barthian could not become reconciled to the concepts of the naturalists, but that does not prevent the naturalist from having a profound insight into the workings of the Barthian mind and religion. The naturalist is trying to get back of surface things and traditional concepts in order to discover the actual processes which are at work.

This is no denial of the facts of religious living. They are obvious to any trained observer. But the naturalist has better tools and techniques for observing what happens and for analyzing the data. If a natural interpretation accounts for all the data, there is no need for a supernatural rendering. Logically, the naturalist's approach is prior to the supernaturalist's. Histori-

cally, as far as Christianity is concerned, the supernatural approach has been prior.

The new naturalism, if it is true to itself, stops at this point. It gives a natural account of the religious phenomena of the world to the best of its ability. If it does this adequately, it has provided the logically prior foundation for a theological superstructure, which should be consistent with the foundation but which may go far beyond it. This is the principle to which Roman Catholic theology has always adhered, however far it may have fallen short of it in practice. Natural theology has fulfilled the place we are suggesting for the new naturalism, which is probably no more than a modern refinement.

Naturalistic metaphysics and empirical method carefully combined provide the foundation stones for a new theology. This is all that the new naturalism should attempt. In order to develop a new theology in any complete form, it is necessary to go beyond the rigorous empiricism of naturalism. By the use of analogical beliefs and rational superstructures, it is possible to work toward a theology which will be adequate for the world today. Such a development is badly needed, and when it is carried through there will be an American theology which will meet the needs of the American people better than either the new naturalism or the traditional theology possibly can. This may prove America's distinctive contribution to ecumenical Christianity, for without sacrificing any of the essential truths of Christianity, this new theology may aid in finding for the world a common ground for Christian unity.

Naturalism is opposed chiefly because it is not understood. It is feared because devout people believe it is attempting to replace Christianity. But it is not attempting to replace the Christian religion. It is not the antithesis of Christianity. It is not a temporary means of presenting the Christian message. It is not a negation of the central truths of Christianity.

The new naturalism may be legitimately opposed only by those who deny the validity of man's knowledge of God and rely entirely upon supernatural revelation. Others may object to the

results, but cannot deny that the purpose is sound. If any natural theology be acceptable, the new naturalism may be understood as one type of natural theology.

Empirical naturalism serves as the basis for any theology which reflects the religious experience of the human race, and it is particularly fitted to test the central truths of the Christian heritage. It is not a negative critique of Christianity. Tentative and humble, it serves as the logically prior basis for any valid theology.

Church Congress Syllabus No. 4

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

PART III. THE CHURCH AS A FELLOWSHIP

By JOHN A. F. MAYNARD

The Biblical Seminary, New York

Strange as it may seem, the subject of Christian fellowship as a whole and with all its bearings has never been treated adequately. The only book which we can thoroughly recommend is *Fellowship in Thought and Prayer* by Basil Mathews and Henry Bisseker, with a preface by Bishop Brent, New York, Gorham, 1920.¹ In the short preface, Bishop Brent who was perhaps better qualified than any one else to write on the subject, remarks that Basil Mathews leaves out the vital subject of the communion of saints.²

We may add to Bishop Brent's criticism of this otherwise excellent work that in its treatment of thought it leaves out the collective intellectual thinking of the Church. It is true that a generation ago dogma was rather relegated to the store room of ecclesiastical knowledge, but now it has come back into its own as a living asset (or liability, as the case may be). Most certainly the Church must be intelligent, and therefore her dogmas are of the utmost importance as part of her character. We must bear in mind, as an important question to be studied, the relationship of fellowship and dogma, and even of the communion of saints and

¹ A later pamphlet by the same authors, *Fellowship as a Means of Building the Christian Social Order*, New York, Doran, 1921, is a remarkable application of the book as a solution to the problem of a new order in society which was with mankind and is and shall be until God's will is done.

² We should also refer to an anonymous pamphlet in much the same vein published a little more than twenty years ago in London by the Student Christian Movement under the title: *The Ordeal of the Church*. The point of view is also largely the application of the fellowship ideal to the social problem of after-war conditions.

dogma. A famous novel of Blasco Ibáñez, who belongs to a past generation, depicted life in the Balearic Islands as a tyranny of past prejudices under the title, *The Dead Command*. But from the Christian point of view, there is no death, and therefore the saints as living forces must be heard if possible, in matters dealing with the noble inheritance for which they often suffered. Certain intellectual treasures have been hallowed by the confessors and saints which may have value within the New Jerusalem, or possibly *extra muros*, or maybe *in partibus*.

The Basic Idea of Fellowship

We may therefore set out as a basis for further study in this syllabus that the study of Christian fellowship is really far more important than any other aspect of Church life (intellectual, liturgical, charitable, missionary) because it pervades them all. Indeed it is essential to the very idea of Church, as much as gregariousness is to civilization. Without fellowship no Church. The Book of the Acts of the Apostles leads us to think that without Church there is no salvation. This is of course true, if the meaning of "Church" is not distorted. Christian fellowship is therefore the very soul of Christianity,³ and highest mystical self-understanding⁴ as of its *non ego*, the world at large.⁵

Pauline Christianity which is coming back today is centered on fellowship.⁶ The Anglican form or formula of religion is only a dead shell of a Church unless it underlines fellowship above

³ We take it as in Bishop Gore's vein. We may refer to his work *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship*.

⁴ An excellent book was written at the beginning of the World War by John Neville Figgis, *The Fellowship of the Mystery*, 1914. This magnificent piece of work gives no longer the right perspective because modernism as a problem is now out of date.

⁵ See, for instance, the work of the great œcumenic defender of the undivided faith, Archbishop N. Soederblom—*Christian Fellowship, or the United Life and Work of Christendom*, New York, 1923. The missionary problem is now one of fellowship. The Madras Conference, and the United Church of India point the way to us who still sin in the darkness of our hearts.

⁶ This is why the best text book on Christian fellowship is the *Epistle to the Ephesians*.

all, practically. When it does it has magnetic power; when it does not it is little more than a respectable affair, a luxury in fact.

If it is not too late we should now define fellowship. Basil Mathews' definition is: "An active comradeship between personalities, man or woman or both, who unite with one another in a common worship, or battle for a common quest, or play their game for the honor of a team, or pool their separate thought in constructing and carrying into effect a single plan, or who simply share the needs and desires of a common humanity."¹

Such fellowship is a life force. Whether we like it or not, the Oxford Group Movement is a characteristic one today. Certain of its aspects may be open to criticism, but the "Group" concept has been Christian energy through fellowship, a quality needed more than ever.

In order to be beneficial, the fellowship idea must not be defeatist. There has been too much talk about the Church's impotence. As a matter of fact every human achievement whether scientific (as in the case of aviation) or social (liberalism, collectivism, and a few other *isms*) is bankrupt, disappointing, and disheartening. The Church, taken in the Pauline and Augustinian sense, is the only asset of civilization today, because she is the only treasury of fellowship. Checks in other treasuries have come back with the note, "No funds."

As a further step in the right direction let us divest ourselves of any association of the word "church" with buildings. The Catholic Church in the Catacombs, the Huguenot Congregations of the Desert, the Episcopal Church of Scotland in the eighteenth century, the non-juring Roman Catholic Church during the French Revolution, Christianity under Soviet rule, are witnesses which we may have to emulate even here if God thinks that we can stand it. Some of us will find relief in the idea that the Church may have no organs and no choir and none of its other pomps.

The Church today has learned that uniformity is a Procrustean bed of little value to the patient. Fellowship is the very opposite

¹ *Fellowship in Thought and Prayer*, pp. 13-14.

of tyranny. A Church alive with it would have avoided the idea of Inquisition as a pest. Hereby awareness of fellowship would have been less noxious, orthodoxy less grievous, narrow-mindedness less imperialistic, broad-mindedness less naive, the hierarchy more human, common folks less stultified.

After all, even though our biblical records lack photographic qualities, it is clear that the prophets were all different personalities, and also the apostles. Yet the former saved the soul of religion and the latter were the most efficient missionary society that ever was. In this case we may even claim at the risk of being called a sermonizer that the twelve apostles, being Jewish, must have had thirteen opinions, but that under the influence of Him who is the only source of true fellowship, they became of one mind.

We may even go further. The Christian dogma of the Trinity is embarrassing unless it is explained in the Augustinian way as necessary to the idea of fellowship. God is love. Therefore He is fellowship, because fellowship is active love. A Unitarian God may be satisfactory to human intelligence. A fellowship God is the only one acceptable to human sympathy. A Unitarian God is static like a theorem. A fellowship God has the dynamism of life and love and light. Genesis begins with the infinite desire of God to communicate Himself. Revelation ends with His necessary coming to save the hope of human fellowship endangered by Antichrist.

From this point of view also, the Bible is justified in its form. It does not concern itself with a notarial history of events cosmic and social, but with a prophetic evaluation of history. Today, the radio spurts history like a machine gun. This is not the biblical way. Christianity should remind us that fellowship must prevail because it is of God, and that we ought not to exaggerate our worries and the disease of the world. God's word of fellowship abides. The Book which reveals God's fellowship in a thousand tongues must outlive the indigestible tomes of *Das Kapital* and the Ersatz diet of *Mein Kampf*. Thus faith in fellowship is the

only antidote against despair in this crisis as in the discouraging aggregate of crisis which we call our own career.

History being absurd and in fact non-existent without the idea of fellowship (either positive to the optimist, or negative to the pessimist), our study of Christian fellowship must follow an historical sequence.

The Undivided Church

National fellowship being a very real fact in Judaism, the early Christians had to annihilate the outcast concept by transposing the idea of "the people of God" and "the chosen people" into the more universal "fellowship of the mystery" (Ephesians 3:9).

We do not know how far the early Christians were aware of the relationship of God and people now familiar to students of the Old Testament. It is not likely that they would have used a phraseology similar to the current handbooks of Old Testament religion, and most certainly not of works inspired by W. Robertson Smith. A far more valuable point of view is that of St. Paul. The contrast he draws between "Israel according to the flesh" and "Israel according to the spirit" is at least masterly. Paul's theory of the church of Abraham being identical with the Christian Church does not appeal to us now, inasmuch as we have lost the biblical background. However it remains fundamentally true. The day came, alas for true fellowship, when this Pauline concept was forgotten. Then an ignorant prophet of Arabia took up again the concept of an Abrahamic faith. The inner value of the idea was demonstrated by the growth of Islam and the destruction of half of Christendom. Had Eastern Christianity placed fellowship above conformity to formulas, Mohammedanism would have perished as based only on the sword, but this partly Abrahamic faith has proved itself superior to all other religions in its real spirit of fellowship, and that is the strength of Islam today. Let us not forget that it is strength stolen from us.

Let us also acknowledge that theoretically the fellowship of the Christian religion is perfect in its mystical Pauline basis, but

that practically we draw lines, ethnical and racial, and by limiting fellowship, we diminish God's manifestation through our group.

An anti-Semitic Church is therefore an abomination. A congregation judging people according to the color of their skin is essentially un-Christian. It matters little whether our concept of the Church is perfect: if unsocial it is not a church concept at all. Most certainly that early Church was superior to us in this particular. The early Church made certain practical demonstrations of fellowship.

The first was Communism. The Book of Acts tells us about it. We may very well ask why the spirit of fellowship failed there. Later, Communism was tried, and even persists in the monastic life (often called "religious"). In this form, it emphasizes separation from the complexities of the world, especially of family problems. Then the idea of fellowship may be pragmatically justified but it is not of universal application. Living without fulfilling the oldest commandment (increase and multiply) caused certain difficulties, and here again Islam with a practical stress on fellowship in a coarse way, overcame an angelic view of Christianity which had lost its wings.

Another experiment in fellowship of the early Church is still with us, namely "almsgiving" (Romans 12:3; I Timothy 6:18; Hebrews 12:16) and especially "the collecting for the saints" (Romans 15:26; II Corinthians 8:4, 9:13). A more scientific relief system rather frowns on the word "alms." Social service is now the open sesame of human poverty. No doubt the Church has maintained rather too long a medieval view of charity which has little value, but that is not the Pauline view of I Corinthians 13. As a matter of fact we may as well accept the view that we shall never see the end of almsgiving. New York seems at times to be social-worker-ridden, but it is the paradise of pan-handlers. The spirit of foolish charity shall ever be with us.

Thirdly, the early Church applied fellowship to the ecclesiastical organization ("the right hand of fellowship," Galatians 2:1). The Anglican Church has not always remembered that the episcopate is less essential to the present than the presbyterate; for a

time, a Church can live without bishops; the value of the episcopate is fellowship as continuity in time. Medieval prelacy caused a reaction because its concept of "the right hand" was not for fellowship but for chastisement and for the receipt of money.

The divisions of Christendom through heresies, through mystical developments, and through the Protestant Reformation may well be studied under the aspect of unfaithfulness to fellowship.

In theory the medieval Mass was a dramatic presentation of the mystery of salvation. It was fellowship translated, but who knew it? Was not the wall often built between choir and nave the symbol that within was a theology where ideas were called reality—and no real fellowship enjoyed with a world unwashed, unlearned, unhealthy, though most interestingly colorful and pagan?

After the Reformation

Whatever theologians may prove to their own satisfaction it remains practically true that the laity of this Church are doing their own thinking, often muddled, but certainly influenced by the ordinary newspaper more than by the church press.

The average American Christian is not a Protestant. He thinks he is, and that is true of the majority of our parishioners. In the American variety of English, people talk of "joining a church." This idiom ought to give us the creeps. The mystical body of Christ is not discerned. The Church is levelled down to a club or lodge for the middle class. Above that, the rich sin expensively, and the very poor sin coarsely below. A good minister is "hired," rather than a saint, to serve a class congregation which quite often is rather vague on what it believes.

What a contrast with Reformation days, when thousands went to the stake or to dungeons for a creed with certainty. The ministry, of course, and a few scattered chosen souls maintain the truth delivered to the saints, but even the most confirmed optimist will recognize the fact just stated. College freshmen for instance have been known to manifest a strange ignorance of religion.

We may perhaps comfort ourselves with the idea that it was so at other times.

The American idea of a church as a human society is quite the opposite of our ideal of a divine society. It gives fellowship of a social kind with a limited scope, without a mystical urge. It is unbiblical, unhistorical, uninspiring. There is little reason to choose between a church where liturgical complexities choke out fellowship in worship, or a church where worship is scarcely above a glee club standard. The search for the beauty of holiness, as our own Church tries to follow it in its liturgical worship, is legitimate. We must admit however that the average person in our midst, unless thoroughly initiated in our ways, may admire what we strive for but does not often achieve fellowship in worship with the clergy.

Should Protestantism return somewhat to Reformation ideas this picture of the average American congregation would cease to be true, and reunion with other Churches which our own Church longs for, if carried on a high level, would be quite a possibility. As we read letters opposed to reunion published in the *Living Church*, we note that the strongest objections would be removed if the Presbyterian Church had not admitted too easily into its ministry men whose point of view is foreign to the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Between the minds of Cranmer, Calvin, and Luther there was fellowship. Between the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century and the Continental churches there was fellowship. A very important question therefore is whether reunion can ever be reached when churches are not in fellowship with their own past.

Even in our own midst, the question of this fellowship with the past is a vital one. Is our past indicated through a concept of English church life which may be provincial and even artificial?

The Future

We are sitting, but not easily, on tomorrow's doorstep. These are days of perplexity. No wonder that some thinkers of value,

and many literalists who scarcely deserve the name of thinkers, are influenced by an apocalyptic view of things. Apocalypticism is better than rationalism. Whether apocalypticism has a sensible view of fellowship is an open question. Is Karl Barth right?

Fellowship in thought with an important part of the world is now difficult. This is the curse of war. Whether pacifism may be lack of fellowship with souls who suffered for human values may even be asked. Another curse of war is that it casts doubts on the sincerity of the honest when they differ from one's collective thought. War is therefore a death-dealing plague to the spirit of fellowship.

We should note that even in times of after-war (for peace there never was) Basil Mathews' book unites in the same chapter fellowship in thought and in prayer, but says very little on the subject of thought. Perhaps prayer matters more.

So prayer is left with us as the sphere of fellowship, and then action, the realm of the good deed. Fellowship in prayer and service, with thought somewhat lame at this time, may be the order of the day.

The crisis which began in 1914 has revealed again to us the importance of belief in divine sufficiency, in God's power to reveal His solution if we listen to His guidance. The test of honest prayer is therefore fellowship with God and obedience.

We may ask ourselves a few more questions. Is not the spirit of disobedience to God which is the negation of religion due to a lack of fellowship? If we "walk with God" are there any real problems?

It is not good for man to be alone, therefore we are supposed to pray together. But do we? Should not communion be fellowship? Are not both terms identical, the first being Latin, the second Anglo-Saxon? Should not the Lord's Table unite us wonderfully?

Missionary zeal should not be a matter of raising money. Fellowship was the missionary method of Saint Paul. Are not some criticisms of missionary work justified? Are we right in letting money talk rather than the mystical fellowship of the foolishness

of the cross? If there is to be a new order, are we getting ready for an honest fellowship with a wounded world-soul?

When I was in Madrid thirty years ago, I saw a poster representing an auto da fé with this legend: "See how they love each other." A little more than three years ago I was almost caught there in the storm translating this sentiment. If the Church lived foremost for fellowship, would nations rise and slaughter the good and the bad in collective criminal madness?

When people judge the value of a religion, of a Church, of a priest or minister, of a Christian, do they take into consideration his mind, or his heart as it speaks through fellowship? Are not the only Bibles read by people the lives translating love into fellowship?

What is the bearing of these commonplace truths on the problem of the reunion of Christendom, which is declared to be the mission of the Church? After all, is fellowship ever commonplace? Is it not rather a paradoxical view of life? Selfishness is not only common but commonplace. Christianity is neither.

If the Eucharist is the only traditional and possibly the only proper method of Christian worship, how can we make it a true sacrament of fellowship, a bond of unity, and not an occasion for sectarianism or for compromise? Are our people going to follow us on this mystical level of communion *and* fellowship? Or are we for ever to remain each one by himself, a voice heralding within the holy rood things that are judged to be rather imaginary in the pews where the laity bear with us without understanding us?

How can those who for excellent reasons advocate a reform in worship on pre-Reformation lines help us to avoid building again a rood reviving scholasticism within, while superstition, indifference, and anti-clericalism thrive outside of our saint's paradise?

And finally is not this Church of ours, with all the defects we know and the failings others speak of, a fair solution of fellowship with its *via media* method? Is there a better way, which sins not against fellowship? To this last question I have no answer.

Questions for Discussion

1. What is your own definition of "fellowship" in the Church? Does it rest on prayer, on the Eucharist, on social contacts, on intellectual agreement, on concerted action?
2. Is it true that "the Church taken in the Pauline and Augustinian sense, is the only asset of civilization today, because she is the only treasury of fellowship"?
3. Is it practical not to "draw lines, ethnical and racial, and by limiting fellowship . . . diminish God's manifestation through our group"?
4. How does today's Communism resemble or differ from the form described in the Book of Acts, so far as fellowship is concerned?
5. Has the Church any practical substitute to offer for "almsgiving"? Under our present economy, is fellowship enough to give the panhandler?
6. Can reunion "ever be reached when churches are not in fellowship with their own past"? Does our past lie in a "concept of English Church life which may be provincial and even artificial"?
7. Has apocalypticism a sensible view of fellowship? Why or why not?
8. Does pacifism involve lack of fellowship with those who suffered for human values?
9. Is the "spirit of disobedience which is the negation of religion due to a lack of fellowship? If we 'walk with God' are there any real problems"?
10. "Is fellowship ever commonplace? Is it not rather a paradoxical view of life?" Why?
11. "If the Eucharist is the only traditional and possibly the only proper method of Christian worship, how can we make it a true sacrament of fellowship, a bond of unity, and not an occasion for sectarianism or for compromise?"
12. See other questions in the last three paragraphs of the syllabus.

Bibliography

- Figgis, John Neville, *The Fellowship of the Mystery*.
 Gore, Charles, *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship*.
 Mathews and Bissek, *Fellowship in Thought and Prayer; Fellowship as a Means of Building the Christian Social Order*.
 Söderblom, N., *Christian Fellowship, or the United Life and Work of Christendom*.
 Student Christian Movement, London, *The Ordeal of the Church*.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By SHERMAN E. JOHNSON,

Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin

In the first speech of Eliphaz, Job 5:3f, is found a difficult passage translated thus by Smith in the American translation:

I have observed the fool taking root;
But I cursed his habitation suddenly.
His children were far from safety,
And were crushed in the gate with none to rescue them.

The King James and Jewish Publication Society translations read similarly. The Massoretic text has וְאָקוּב, "and I cursed," the first singular imperfect of the double ayin verb קָבַב. Brown, Driver and Briggs, s. v., suggest that Job 5:3 is probably corrupt here. The Greek reads ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ διαίτα, "their dwelling was consumed." The emendations of the text have been many and radical. Merx, Siegfried, Bickell, Beer, Duhm and Ehrlich change the verb to רָקַב, "to rot," which idea the ICC characterizes as not very probable with "habitation." Recognizing this, Cheyne, and Moffatt in his translation, substitute for "habitation" the word "branches." Budde uses a nifal imperfect third singular of פָּקַד to give the idea of a place being empty. It will be observed that not only is there disagreement between the Greek and Massoretic texts, but that the adverb *pithom*, "suddenly," does not fit with the Massoretic "I cursed," nor does the idea of Eliphaz, cursing the dwelling, even of a fool, seem congruous. If, however, the lines of the unpointed text are studied, it will be noticed that in the two parts of verse 3 there are in each line in the same approximate position in the line, and in the same order, the letters koph waw beth nun:

וּאֶקֶב נִחֻוּ פְתָאִים
יִרְחֻקוּ בְנֵי מִישַׁע

Notice the possibility of slight clerical error, confusing the order of these letters in the two lines. I would suggest that as the copyist's eyes followed the lines he substituted the order of letters of the second member for the original order of the first member following the aleph, writing as above **ואמקני** rather than **ואמקנ**. Verse 3 anticipates a word that will state directly what happened suddenly to the habitation of the fool. Without change of letters and with only this slight and excusable change in order, this is supplied. The verse would read:

I have seen the fool putting down his roots
When suddenly his habitation (became) dust;
His children were far from safety,
And were crushed in the gate with no one rescuing.

A similar picture is presented in Isa. 40:23f:

Who brings princes to nothing,
And makes the rulers of the earth like a cipher—
Hardly have they been planted, hardly have they been sown,
Hardly has their stock taken root in the earth,
When he blows upon them, and they wither,
And the whirlwind carries them away like stubble.

J. H. J.

Rabbi Max Kadushin's *Organic Thinking* (New York, 1938; cf. Fleming James' review, *ATR* XXI [1939], 316-8), with its thesis that rabbinic thought was not coördinated into a logical system but into an organic system, is an important book for the study of early Christian thought. The ideas of the rabbis are not embodied in "a logical system of ideas and concepts having a hierarchical relation to one another" but rather in a "net-work of concepts," of which the fundamental four are "God's loving-kindness, His justice, Torah, and Israel"; there are a number of others, but all are related to these four. The same is roughly true of our Lord's thought and that of St. Paul; and as in rabbinic thought, these concepts are not set forth as abstractions but normally appear embodied in concrete examples. Jesus' interpretation of Torah is usually set forth in stories and parables which

illustrate some aspect of God's dealings with man; even such sayings as the Beatitudes deal with practical action rather than with an abstract categorical imperative, and such sayings as Matt. 5:38-42 are extremely concrete. His modes of thought are nearer to the prophetic than to the rabbinical, yet these four ideas remain the focal points of His thinking, which are brought to bear on practically every concrete issue.

So also with St. Paul. His thought is somewhat influenced by popular Greek philosophy, yet the concepts of God's loving-kindness and justice are the controlling factors in Rom. 1-8; and the problem of Rom. 9-11 can be understood only as coming from a Jewish thinker who refuses to deny either attribute of God's nature. In Paul's religion, over against Torah is set God's loving-kindness in the form of the subconcept "gospel," and his struggles in Rom. 5-7 to reconcile the two show that we are dealing with organic, rather than strictly logical, thinking. (Dodd's commentary seems to show good appreciation of this fact.) One should note that while Paul rejects one form of Torah he is never willing to turn his back on the concept altogether (Rom. 3:1f; 7:12). The Epistle to the Romans has been baffling to occidental thinkers because they have seldom realized that the Jewish apostle's mind worked differently from theirs. Dr. Kadushin points out that the rabbis do not define their terms formally (p. 191); no more did the New Testament writers, a situation that has caused endless trouble to exegetes and theologians; and here St. Paul is the worst offender. The fact is that the concepts are so rich in associations and are so intimately interrelated, that they must inevitably be somewhat fluid. Creation, redemption, the Messianic age, the last judgment—any one of them implies all the rest. Organic thinking persists all through the New Testament because the religious experience of Christians was extremely rich, and they refused to turn their backs on any element of it which was of real value.

Early Christian thought seems to add further concepts to the fundamental four. That of Jesus's Messiahship involves Him in every relation in which God is involved. The Kingdom of

God, instead of being a subsidiary concept, becomes a controlling one, almost replacing that of Israel; while the Church idea is a development of the Israel concept. A study of these concepts along Kadushin's lines would be very helpful. The antinomies of divine grace on the one hand and human freedom and moral effort on the other; of community authority and individual freedom; of the divine and human natures of Christ, all have their roots in the N. T. and are good examples of the stuff on which organic thinking goes to work. (Cf. Kadushin on paradox, pp. 196f.) It was inevitable that later Greek and Latin thinkers should try to systematize biblical thought, but it is obvious that in the N. T., generally speaking, we have the materials for theology rather than a theological system.

S. E. J.

BOOK REVIEWS

Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band 3. By Walther Eichrodt. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939, pp. iv + 191. RM. 4 (bound, RM. 5).

This is the final installment of Professor Eichrodt's imposing work of some 325,000 words on the theology of the Old Testament. Vol. I (1933, reviewed *ATR*, Jan. 1934) deals with God and the People of Israel, Vol. II (1935, reviewed *ATR*, Jan. 1936) with God and the World, the present volume with God and Man. The subjects treated are: (1) Individualism and collectivism in the Old Testament relationship to God. Here the author shows that Israel's religion at the outset and increasingly thereafter fostered a balance between the two. (2) The fundamental forms of the personal relationship to God. These include the fear of God, faith, and love towards God. A special section is devoted to the post-exilic period. (3) The working out of religion in conduct (Old Testament morality). This subject falls into three divisions: (a) the norms of moral conduct; folk-morality, the idea of God, the working of the prophetic movement, the norms of the church of the Law; (b) the values (Güter) aimed at in moral conduct: the natural values losing their absolute worth in favor of the religious value of salvation, and an unreconciled tension being set up between the two; (c) motives of moral conduct: the motives given by nature and operating within the covenant, the new grounding of the theonomy in loving surrender to God, and the later reduction of motives to a material plane, thus destroying their unity. (4) Sin and forgiveness; sin's nature, universality, origin, result (guilt and punishment), and its removal; the nature of forgiveness, as mediated by divinely appointed atonement, or as God's free personal act, or again as His saving work in the time of the end; requiring in men the thoroughgoing change known as repentance, and springing from God's faithfulness to His covenant, His pity for man's transitoriness, and His honor and love. (5) The indestructibility of the individual's fellowship with God. Here the author shows how the earlier acceptance of death as the end appointed by God was modified by Ezekiel's idea of the resurrection of the people and finally gave place in outstanding saints to the conviction that the individual would overcome death, either through a divine eschatological act or by virtue of his present companionship with God. The later spread of belief in immortality was accompanied by a dogmatizing upon it which lost sight of the fact that it was God's free gift, until this was reasserted by the New Testament church.

The third volume falls no whit behind the first two in its learning, freshness, vigor, insight, power of thought and warmth of religious feeling. The work as a whole is a massive achievement and makes a noble contribution to the study of the Bible.

FLEMING JAMES.

The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth. By Donald W. Riddle. University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. ix + 305. \$3.00.

The study of environmental factors in producing social patterns in religion has of recent years been particularly advanced in the University of Chicago under the leadership of Dr. S. J. Case. In the present volume Dr. Riddle applies this "social pattern" method rigorously to Gospel origins. If form criticism has taught us anything, it is that the fundamental factor in producing a form is the "Sitz im Leben" of the material. So by studying the material we can determine the type of life in which it has its place; then, by identifying the locale of that type of life, the origin of the material is likewise identified. The principle is familiar to all students of the Gospel but Dr. Riddle is the first specialist to undertake a complete survey of the entire field with this method as an absolute guide.

Now let it be said—especially in view of certain rather drastic criticisms below—that to all advanced students of the subject the volume is of high value. The approach differs so greatly from that of conventional treatises that the reader—if he is able to use the book judiciously—will find almost every page stimulating. He will wish to go back over it again and again. And, the more he has felt that Gospel origins are now pretty well clarified, the more he will learn from Dr. Riddle. Let this all be said unmistakably.

None the less, let it also be said unmistakably that use of this book by an uninformed reader would mean simple disaster. For Dr. Riddle does not consider for a moment that the "social patterns" method has very grave limitations. Nor does he consider with sufficient care that such patterns are often very difficult to identify; and that to apply them without proper preliminary analysis only caricatures history.

The limitation of the "social patterns" method is that it assumes that environment is everything; if an environment is Greek, any religion appearing in this environment will take a Greek form. But we know the contrary. Nothing is more un-Greek than belief in the resurrection of the body, but this purely Jewish tenet became in early Christianity a dogma of the standing or falling Church; to deny it meant banishment into the outer darkness of gnosticism. In fact such purely Greek minds as Justin and Irenaeus out-Judaized the Jews in finding "resurrection of the body" insufficiently explicit and they substituted for it "resurrection of the *flesh*." Here is a very obvious example of how a religion can thrust into a thought-world an ideal completely alien to that world and compel its adoption. Another example of the same possibility—and one more profoundly influential in modifying environmental patterns—is the adoption in the Greek Christian world of Jewish ideals in sexual ethics in contrast to both traditional Hellenic laxness and later Hellenistic-Oriental asceticism. Naturally the Greek environment modified the Jewish teaching but never so far as to destroy its essential Judaism.

But Christian sexual ethics went beyond Jewish in its prohibition of divorce; a prohibition with profound influence on later social patterns. And the origin of the prohibition was in no group pattern but in the teaching of a single individual, Jesus. And where Christianity went, the divorce prohibition went with

it, with no relation whatever to environmental factors; usually in polemic defiance of them. Here is an unambiguous instance of the limitation of the "pattern" method; it does not allow for the influencing of the individual in transforming patterns. This limitation is exhibited clearly in Dr. Riddle's book, which dismisses Jesus in a paragraph. Undoubtedly he lived, undoubtedly he taught. But his teachings were accepted and adopted only when they accorded with the patterns of his followers; otherwise they were modified to fit these patterns or were discarded altogether. What formed Christianity belonged to a different sphere: "In the beginning was the kerygma" and so the cult, which alone was vital.

The "kerygma" phrase has behind it the high authority of Martin Dibelius, but even as he uses it—very differently from Dr. Riddle—it contains an error. The real truth is "In the beginning was the Rabbi," the teacher with disciples, like the other Jewish teachers with disciples, disciples whose business in life it was to memorize in detail and verbatim what the master taught, in order to transmit this teaching to their own disciples. But with a difference. Almost immediately after Jesus' death the kerygma began and with it the conviction that this Rabbi, in many regards like other Rabbis, was in deepest essence totally different from them: Jesus was none other than God's Messiah; the Bearer of God's final revelation; the Judge of living and dead. His teachings therefore were sacrosanct and infallible. And, since the Teacher will be the Judge, obedience to the teachings will be required by the Judge; knowledge of the teachings is vital since all must face the Judge. Consequently preservation of the teachings was no haphazard matter nor could they be modified at will by every new social pattern into which they entered. If they and the pattern did not agree, it was the pattern that must be altered, cost what it may.

Modifications of Jesus' teaching were of course inevitable and modifications took place. But the general extent and nature of the modifications can be studied informally in the matter of the divorce prohibition. Mark adapts it to a gentile environment; Matthew readapts Mark's adaptation to a Jewish environment; Paul adapts it to the novel case of "mixed" marriages. Form criticism guides us as to the nature, place and date of these successive adaptations. But through them all the essential content remains static, itself wholly unaffected by the varying environment; if anything the adaptations tend to make application of the principle more remorseless. That all of Jesus' sayings fared so well in transmission no one would assert but the general principle is clear: at least in theory, not surrounding social pattern but the teaching of Jesus was regarded by Christians as determinative. Only when this fact is fully recognized can the history of Gospel tradition be written so as to state what actually took place.

In the second place, Dr. Riddle's investigation and classification of social patterns is most inadequate. To establish what Jesus actually taught is a critical problem of the highest complexity but to establish the approved Jewish teaching in Jesus' day is even more complicated, since the sources are more remote and far more affected by later conceptions. Since the publication of the Strack-Billerbeck work the task is simpler; but Dr. Riddle ignores Strack-Billerbeck

to follow authorities he does not name. The result is amazing. He tells us that the Corban controversy cannot be authentic because the prohibition of breaking vows was in the written Torah (p. 56)—as if the "tradition" were not vitally concerned with exceptions to the written Torah. He tells that Judaism had nothing analogous to sacraments (p. 70), forgetting that the people ate the peace-offerings and that the baptism of proselytes was construed as effecting a new birth. He tells us that the Jews prohibited exorcism altogether (pp. 29, 45), ignoring the exorcistic formulas and charms taught in the Talmud and the fact that very great Rabbis gained fame as exorcists. The climax is reached, however, on page 43 where we are astounded to read that salvation of the individual was "not a Jewish conception at all" and therefore the parable of the Prodigal Son must "come from a Greek environment." If applied to the Old Testament this would prove that the stories of individual repentance and pardon told there come from a Greek environment also.

What this amazing reconstruction of Jewish social patterns does to the history of the Gospel material needs no description. Its danger is that tyros will assume that Dr. Riddle's assertions—made with extreme positiveness although without citing a scrap of authority—are to be accepted as seriously as they are propounded. No better book, consequently, can be imagined to give beginners a completely perverted picture of the history of the earliest Christianity.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON.

Christ. By W. R. Matthews. New York: Macmillan Co., 1939, pp. ix + 149. \$2.00.

The form of this little volume is determined by the English series *What Did They Teach?* for which it was written: "as objectively as possible a statement of the facts in each case." The tone is therefore detached and judicious, with at least a summary of the evidence on both sides before a decision is reached; as befits an Anglican dignitary the style is that of an English judge. One may, indeed, feel that there is a little too much of the Anglican tradition; form criticism is ignored and here and there an appeal is made to "the testimony of the manuscripts" to prove the authenticity of a saying; in the preliminary chapter undue weight is placed on the Johannine evidence; the Messiahship is discussed before the ethics, etc. Yet a closer study shows that Dean Matthews is quite capable of penetrating under the surface. After laying perhaps rather too much stress on the unimportance of the apocalyptic, he quotes with approval Dr. Whitehead's emphasis on its value in isolating temporal conditioning from permanent worth, so enabling absolute ethical intuitions. No better summary of Christ's attitude toward the Law could be given than "Jesus read the Old Testament with the mind of a prophet and not with that of an exegete." He says squarely of the theological doctrine of God's impassibility "it is the conviction of the present writer that the teaching of Jesus does plainly indicate that God needs man and yearns for man's response to love." In the chapter on the Church the continuity of the "Israel" concept is stressed and within this larger continuity the little flock forms the germ of a new development. But no organization was directed; "the Church is left to the freedom of the

Spirit—the most difficult and dangerous of all freedoms and the only one which is worth having.”

BURTON SCOTT EASTON.

Environmental Factors in Christian History. Edited by John T. McNeill, Matthew Spinka, Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. x + 417. \$4.00.

In the summer of 1938 Shirley Jackson Case retired after thirty years of teaching in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago—years devoted particularly to the stimulation of creative scholarship and research. His own contribution is represented by a dozen important books and a multitude of monographs and articles. Men trained under him occupy academic positions from Maine and Virginia to Japan and India. The *Denkschrift* presented to him in recognition of his services to theological education contains twenty-one essays by colleagues and former students. These studies are “designed to illustrate an approach to the history of Christianity in which Dr. Case has done distinguished and pioneer service.” Though they range “through widely varied fields they are presented in the hope that together they may help to illumine the broad theme of the impact of non-Christian and nonreligious elements in culture and society upon the historical development of Christian thought, life, and institutions.” Very properly, nearly half of them deal with various aspects of the first three centuries, the field in which Dr. Case has been primarily interested. These differ a good deal in method and maturity and occasionally insinuate the impression that much in historical Christianity can hardly be called Christian save by a rare exercise of charity.

Merely to list the titles and authors would greatly extend the length of this review. To single out a few for comment would be invidious and introduce a subjective factor. Among others, three which arrested this reviewer are: “Roman Religious Survivals in Christianity,” by Dean Emeritus Gordon J. Laing; “Aristotelianism in Western Christianity,” by Prof. Richard McKeon; and (because of its present relevance) “Christianity in its modern Japanese Environment,” by Prof. D. C. Holton of Aoyama Gakuin, Tokyo.

The volume is commended to those interested in tracing the social and historical conditioning of our religion, from the Jordan valley in the time of St. John Baptist to the Mississippi valley in the days of the Methodist circuit-riders.

P. V. NORWOOD.

Suffering, Human and Divine. By H. Wheeler Robinson. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. xx + 230. \$2.00.

To write a book on the problem of pain and suffering is a severe test for any religious thinker. Dr. Rufus M. Jones, the editor of the Great Issues of Life Series, of which the volume under review is the latest to appear, says in his Introduction that he knew when he asked Dr. Robinson to write on suffering that he was giving him the most difficult task which the Series would impose.

Dr. Robinson has discharged well his assignment and has given one more proof of possessing extraordinary theological versatility as well as deep religious and Christian insight. He has done more than simply write another book, covering once again fairly familiar territory. With the exception of his treatment of the doctrine of the atonement, he has indeed broken no new ground. But he has succeeded in dealing with his theme so freshly and honestly that many a reader even when he does not find much new light will receive strength to go in the pathway of obedience and faith.

Suffering, Human and Divine is thus a fairly simple and a very direct book, making no claim to be exhaustive and prepared with the ordinary thoughtful reader in mind. It is not, save in plan, a systematic treatise and the discussion of the unavoidable problems of theology and philosophy is reduced to a minimum. Indeed the title leads one to expect a rather fuller treatment of the being of God in relation to suffering than the work actually provides.

Dr. Robinson begins with a frank recognition of the fact and problem of suffering and then reviews sketchily some of the principal theodicies that have appeared in the history of thought. He follows this review with a masterly chapter on suffering in the Old Testament and goes on to open up the subjects of sin and the relation of sin and suffering to the fact of society or basic social relatedness. Next we have a treatment of divine providence in relation to nature, history, and the individual, followed by a discussion in three chapters of the divine side of human and cosmic suffering. In this connection Dr. Robinson offers us an acute and thoughtful analysis of the idea of the atonement. A definite weakness however is his failure to pass from the solution claimed here to a comparable solution of the problem posed by 'natural' suffering.

In the end our author falls back upon a practical and experimental solution, which he calls *solvitur patiendo*. This is sound alike from a realistic and a Christian angle. Food is thus provided for the pilgrim on his journey. There is room, however, for a more intensive wrestle and a more extensive exploration of the theological problem in all its phases than this volume provides. When it comes we may have a theological classic; that certainly *Suffering Human and Divine* cannot be said to be.

CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR.

A Comprehensive Church. Edited by H. D. A. Major. Oxford: Blackwell. 3s. 6d.

This is the title of the Modern Churchman's Conference for this year reported in the September issue of the *Modern Churchman*. The report consists of fourteen papers by various leaders of the group. The general emphasis throughout is on the desirability of doctrinal latitude within the Church. It is rather surprising to note that none of the papers deals with the Church of the New Testament or its comprehensiveness. Moreover, it would seem that the chief point of interest is in what the Church *might be* rather than what it actually is.

The first paper, the Presidential address by Sir Cyril Norwood, on the Ideal of a Comprehensive Church, attempts to present the view of the educated layman who is alarmed over the fact that Nationalism is everywhere stronger than

Christianity. The suggested remedy for the situation is based on the assumption that the Church is the nation on its religious side. A truly comprehensive Church must, therefore, first be national for then, and only then, it can strive for federation with other churches.

Of the several papers which discuss with approval various aspects of the Doctrinal Report, Professor Creed's on Christology is by far the most suggestive. The Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich writes on the Ministry and Sacraments of a Comprehensive Church. He accepts the Congregational principle of the validity of any ministry acceptable to the particular body of Christians it serves, and urges Intercommunion as a means to a federation of the churches. He closes his paper with a misquotation of Matthew xxiii. 23.

Among other papers of interest may be mentioned Dean Inge on Doctrinal Latitude in History; C. F. Russell on God and Nature; C. J. Wright, The Doctrine of the Incarnation and its Presuppositions; and Middleton Murry on The Holy Spirit and the Church.

PAUL S. KRAMER.

Christianity and Morals. By Edward Westermarck. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. xiii + 422. \$5.00.

The author, as he has made abundantly evident in previous works, belongs to the "Evolutionary School" of ethical theory. He does not believe that any ethical concept has objective value because of its origin. Necessarily, therefore, he would deny such objective value to ethical principles taught in the Old Testament as the Word of God or those in the New Testament based upon the teachings of Jesus. As this fundamental view of morals lies at the base of this book, the reader must be prepared to base his judgment of the author's conclusions upon this fact.

This reviewer does believe that God has revealed himself in Jesus and that Jesus' teachings have objective value on that account. However, a review should not be a debate between the author and the reviewer for the former is not present to defend himself. So the review after this opening statement will give an outline of the author's procedure.

The Ethics of Jesus are discussed in detail and at length and on the whole quite fairly. Then Paul's moral teaching is treated, followed by chapters devoted to the teaching of the Church both before and after Augustine. Special topics such as asceticism, slavery, marriage and divorce are then considered. As one of his conclusions the author denies that Christianity has been the greatest moral force in Europe, from which the reviewer must dissent. As one analyzes the author's statements and arguments one cannot help but feel that he has been very one-sided in his choice of the representatives of Christianity and that his fundamental idea of the origin of morals has colored his whole treatment of the question. The book is very valuable as representing its particular point of view and as providing a large amount of material for any one who wishes to study that point of view.

F. A. McELWAIN.

Fundamentals of Christian Statesmanship. By James Wallace. New York: Revell, 1939, pp. 380. \$3.00.

It is seldom that a man reaches the age of 90 years. It is still rarer when he closes a long and useful life and leaves behind him a book which is as representative of that life as is this one. Dr. Wallace was not only a former honored President of Macalester College but after his retirement from administrative duty taught for a number of years. This book is the fruit not only of thought but also of teaching experience. This latter is seen in the way in which he has arranged his material and in the topical questions with which each section of the book closes.

The author's fundamental belief is that the methods and aims of politics and statecraft can be Christianized and that such a consummation is the great need of our day.

After setting forth by quotations from both Old and New Testaments the Biblical conception of the state, he contrasts that with several of the views prevailing at the present such as the American, British, and German. Then after a brief discussion of biblical ethics and the Great War, the largest section of the book is devoted to the study of the contributions which Christianity has made to the state. This is an impressive accounting and worthy of closer study. It is not only excellent apologetic but it gives closer indications of how and when the Christian religion and the Christian church can be truly helpful to the state without attempting to dictate the details of its policy.

The chapter which follows on the relation of Church and State is not as well done as are the other sections of the book. It suffers from the necessity of compression and while it does bring out the proper relationship clearly its review of certain points of history is not full enough to be satisfactory.

The last chapter is a challenging one addressed to American Christians. The book as a whole is a most useful study of its subject and its arrangement will make it particularly helpful to those conducting adult Bible classes or similar courses in colleges. Some objection might be made to the author's method of interpretation but on the whole it is in accordance with accepted principles and is based upon the assured results of modern scholarship.

F. A. McELWAIN.

The Philosophy of Courage or the Oxford Group Way. By Philip Leon. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939, pp. 222. \$2.00.

Life is full of amazements. This book is one. Its author took a double first class in the greatest and most exacting of the "Schools" of Oxford. He is head of the Department of Classics and Philosophy at University College, Leicester, and Examiner to the University of London. In 1935 he published a brilliant book in moral philosophy or ethics entitled *The Ethics of Power or The Problem of Evil*. It has received very high praise, for example, by Croce in Italy and by Reinhold Niebuhr in this country. Now Professor Leon appears as a definite convert to Christianity as exemplified in "the Oxford Group Way" and in the work under review gives us a presentation of this "way" done with great earnestness and sincerity.

The Philosophy of Courage, as the title indicates, is more than a simple exposition or a personal confession. It is an attempt to reduce, or translate, the principles of the Group Movement into a philosophy. The author believes that his own discovery of the reality of God has 'a public aspect.' 'It is the latter,' he says, 'that I propose to give in the following pages in the language of philosophy, psychology and of the imagination' (Introd., p. 12).

The first chapter is a discussion of God and Myself. They are 'undeniable facts,' 'which no one can deny,' and provide a properly philosophical starting point. The author accepts as valid the ontological argument but for purposes of his immediate discussion relies principally upon concrete instances or acts of absolute love, wisdom, or unselfishness as demonstrating the factualness of God. The self is defined as 'a group or pattern of particular desires' (p. 50) and is differentiated from God as the finite from the infinite and as the sick or diseased from the absolutely pure or healthful. But the question, What becomes of the self when God is admitted? and the question behind that, Does the self have any ontal reality alongside God? are not directly considered. On p. 53 the self is apparently identified with fear, impurity, disease, and sin. Philosophically this seems to imply ultimate monism, God being conceived of as an infinite substance and evil as essentially negative; but I am not sure that Leon really means this.

The second chapter or section is entitled 'Demonstration by Experiment' and is given up to an exposition of the 'Quiet Time' considered as a confrontation of the self by the absolutes or God. The experience of God thus yielded is presented in contrast to 'mystical experience' as not particular, not specialist, not inexplicable and not ineffable. Positively it is the experience of inner revolution felt 'as a revolution of everything outside me—a World Revolution'—as an absorption in God, which is heaven or eternity—as a reversal of the process described by Wordsworth in his *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*.

The author, thirdly, turns to 'sharing or spreading the World Revolution.' Here he devotes himself to an explication of the concept of the larger self or the tangle made up by all selves including the whole of nature and forming 'one diseased gigantic body' (see p. 130). This larger self appears to be hypostatized and as 'the kingdom of fear or inertia' is presented as the enemy of conversions and of the World Revolution. Finally we have an essay on Changing Society, the theme being developed in relation to depersonalisation, childhood and education, sex and marriage, the economic problem, political science, philosophy and art. Truly a program of World Revolution! The work ends on a lyrical and apocalyptic (but not eschatological) note. 'The hour of the Resurrection is striking now' (p. 215).

Such is the book in outline. It seems fairest, most informative, and the best criticism simply to exhibit it thus, even if inadequately. One comes to the end hardly knowing what to think. One wonders whether one is not oneself a little mad. Yet there is not a little in *The Philosophy of Courage* to praise. There is profundity at times and honesty. There is a sense of the depth and extent of evil. The author seems so evidently to have been struggling toward the light. And one remembers that there was a time when the world was very dark and

when not a few philosophers, men like Justin, Athenagoras, and Clement, beheld the light that was in Christ and turned their faces and their souls toward it. The Church today is weak in the power to convert men. But one must say in all soberness that Leon shows the very great need of the Group Movement for the Church. And (though it is tautological to add them) the Bible and Christian Tradition.

CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR.

Man the Measure. An Essay on Humanism as Religion. By Arthur Hazard Dakin. Princeton University Press, 1939, pp. 284 \$3.00.

The author of this volume addresses himself to a critique of religious humanism. Its American exponents are chiefly considered, though the significant writings of Bertrand Russell, J. S. Huxley, and Nicolai Hartmann are not overlooked. Also basic for discussion is "A Humanist Manifesto," published in 1933, and signed by many distinguished names in American education, journalism, and religion. The historic backgrounds of the movement are analysed, and successive chapters treat respectively of humanism and science, psychology, ethics (practical and speculative), and religion. Bits of irony, even ridicule enliven the pages at times, without seriously impairing the fairness of the theistic critic.

The principal lines of argument are not unfamiliar. The humanists are charged with a confusion of scientific attitude with scientific method, and failure to appreciate the limitations of the latter in dealing with artistic, moral, and religious values. They over-simplify the natural-supernatural categories into an "either-or" dualism, and limit the supernatural to the realm "where the natural fails or is absent"—in other words ignore the doctrine of immanence. The vagueness of the goal which humanists seek is joined to unexamined assumptions of certain supreme values, such as human personality, which, indeed, cannot be tested by their own methodology. "Everything hinges upon whether or not a satisfactory equivalent for God can be found" (p. 259). Their ideas about theistic religion are partial and uncritical, more the result of emotional reaction to a "provincial Protestant theology" than of unbiased examination of the most enlightened of modern theistic apologists. For, says the writer, "few theists cherish exactly what humanists reject," and there are no positive values cherished by humanists which are not also fostered (in fact, filched from) theists.

Mr. Dakin has stated his case ably and clearly. His argument, however, would have been stronger had he not purposely left his own view of theism and Christianity "amorphous." This is especially evident in the discussion of ethics, where it is hard to distinguish the ethical principles of humanism from those of theism. It is not altogether fair to rest the argument against humanistic ethics on its dependence upon "its Christian origin and environment"; and it is somewhat perilous to appeal to utilitarian motives for belief in God by remarking that "once God or His equivalent goes, reason begins to parley with the old Adam" (p. 170). At other times the argument is based on a vague intuitionism covered over by metaphorical appeals to life at its "deepest levels,"

or a reliance upon "an obscure but fruitful awareness of and response to a reality essentially unlike us yet satisfying our most exacting demands in proportion to the fullness and justness of our devotion to it" (p. 160).

One gets the impression from this book that religious humanism is definitely on the wane and fast becoming a thing of the past. Time, of course, will tell. Those who wish an introduction to its literature will find in this book a reliable guide.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

The World's Great Catholic Poetry. Compiled by Thomas Walsh. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. 584. \$1.69.

"'By taste are ye saved' is the gospel of the Church of England" was a remark of Ralph Waldo Emerson. It may be so, though we think Mr. Emerson guilty of exaggeration. But certainly modern Roman Catholics will never be justly charged with this offense. Whatever the cause or causes they seem in the main safe from that indictment in such fields as music, architecture, vestments, ceremonial, and in this anthology of poetry. In the first place why must they attempt to present "The World's Great Catholic Poetry," meaning by that the world's great poetry created by communicants of the Roman Catholic Church? Does any lover of poetry suppose that the Muse can be thus denationalized? Does any lover of poetry suspend judgment on a poem until he can learn whether the creator is a Presbyterian or a Quaker, an Anglican or a Roman? The world's great Catholic poetry as anyone knows has not been written by Romanists alone—nor by Protestants alone, nor even by Christians alone. Poetry is catholic in the larger sense. To be sure the editor of this anthology, the late Dr. Thomas Walsh, recognized this himself, and was forced in his preface to make a rather lame apology for deserting his title and including "in a special division" masterpieces which he regards as "in a way a body of Catholic poetry not altogether of its fold yet definitely and unmistakably to be based on Catholic foundations," whatever that may mean. This division is entitled "Catholic Poems by Non-Catholic Poets." Among these, to the amusement of Anglicans, will be found Sir Walter Raleigh, William Shakespeare, William Wordsworth, Charles Lamb, Alfred Tennyson, Christina Rossetti, and Evelyn Underhill.

The editor of this revised edition, George N. Shuster, has gone a step further and added yet another division entitled "Additional Poems by Catholic and Non-Catholic Poets" which of course leaves one quite pleasantly at sea as to just which is which and how far each might qualify in the main body of the work. In other words, such as it is, this is not strictly a Roman Catholic anthology as it purports to be but an anthology of poems (written by all sorts and conditions of men) which happen to commend themselves as pious according to the standard of Thomas Walsh, LL.D., who is described by the sub-editor as "somewhat of a Spanish grandee, a little of a Dr. Johnson, very much of an American gentleman, and to his finger tips a lover of the poets." And I should add that this is probably one of very few anthologies of poetry ever published guaranteed not to injure anyone's faith, since it carries the imprimatur

of the late Cardinal Hayes of New York to whom it is dedicated, as well as the o.k. of Dr. Scanlan, *Censor Librorum*.

It is a singular compilation. Page after page of Greek and Latin translations by the well known Anglican Tractarian priest, John Mason Neale, are produced, yet his name appears neither in the index of authors nor in the biographical data! Certain giants are given but a glance. For example G. K. Chesterton is assigned but one poem, "Lepanto;" Francis Thompson but one, "The Hound of Heaven;" John Henry Newman is given but two, one being, of course, "Lead Kindly Light;" Donne is not mentioned. T. S. Eliot, author of *Murder in the Cathedral* and *The Rock*, does not appear, though Ezra Pound is given a place; but Thomas Walsh the editor, surely a very minor poet, either as translator from the Spanish and German or as author of verses of his own appears and reappears with disconcerting frequency.

It is a curious volume, providing verses of most unequal worth, many of them without distinction, the best of them available of course in other anthologies, where in the main they keep a goodlier poetical company, whatever heretics may rub their elbows.

We have a long shelf of anthologies and this one shall be added, but I fear it will not be used very often, for the good poems in it are more instantly available elsewhere, and the bad ones we never want to see again. As for those that are indifferent, they will fade away as the years go on without assurance of immortality despite the recommendations of Dr. Thomas Walsh, Gentleman, and the imprimatur of that fine Christian Prelate, His Eminence the late Cardinal Hayes of New York.

GEO. CRAIG STEWART.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Biblical

The Story of the Apocrypha. By E. J. Goodspeed. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. 150. \$2.00.

Anyone who wants a good brief introduction to the separate books of the Apocrypha will find it here. There are also chapters on the Apocrypha in the New Testament and in the Church.

A. H. F.

A Hellenistic Greek Reader. Selections from the Koine of the New Testament Period. With Vocabulary and Notes. By E. C. Colwell and J. R. Mantey. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. xv + 229. \$2.00.

The title and subtitle of this book show with sufficient clearness what it is. The Greek Bible occupies about fifty pages, then Enoch, Philo, Josephus, some of the Apostolic Fathers, Acts of Paul, Papyri, Diodorus Siculus, Epictetus. Plutarch would probably be flattered by being left out for he tried to be an Atticist, but 'environmental factors' were sometimes too much for him and some of his apothegms would have illustrated similar 'forms' in the Gospels. However anyone can think of something else that might be in a book of Selections and is not, and this one will serve its purpose very well.

A. H. F.

History, Doctrine, Philosophy

The Sacheverell Affair. By Abbie Turner Scudi. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939, pp. 170. \$2.25.

Henry Sacheverell's sonorous name has perhaps saved him from the oblivion that might have befallen him had he been a member of the Smith family. In Queen Anne's time he was a colorful figure in the public eye: reviled as a bigoted and blatant rabble-rouser ("The Church in danger!"), or applauded as the dauntless champion of Anglican ascendancy against traitorous Whigs and malignant Dissenters. His impeachment (in 1709) before the Lords on charges of high crime and misdemeanour was a *cause célèbre*, which turned out to be a fiasco, with the Whig ministry overthrown and the unscathed Sacheverell in possession, after three short years' inhibition, of a juicy royal living.

Dr. Scudi has written the first circumstantial account to be given in recent years of this famous trial, making excellent use of a great mass of contemporary books and pamphlets. Her story is vivid and exciting, and through it all stands clear the magnitude of the constitutional and ecclesiastical issues involved. No less clear is the impression of Sacheverell's sincerity, however narrow-grooved.

The book is a careful and scholarly treatment of a party contest in which great principles were contending and the outcome of which played considerable

part in the development of cabinet government. The subject, therefore, deserves the attention of students of government no less than of those devoted to the study of church history. On p. 98 it is implied that Archbishop Tillotson was still living at the time, whereas in fact he had died in 1694.

P. V. N.

Geschichte, Lehre, und Verfassung der Orthodoxen Kirche. Ed. by Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze. Leipzig: Klotz, 1939, pp. 160. RM. 5.25.

The general editor of the series ("Ekklesia") in which this work appears writes an introductory chapter in which he expresses his appreciation of the Eastern Church and frees it from the old charge of "stagnation"; it is not certain, however, that he at all points rightly understands the position of that Church, and the irritating misuse of the term "oecumenical" is far too frequent, an abuse which of course does not occur in the remainder of the book written by scholars of the Eastern Church. The names of these scholars need only be mentioned—Papadopoulos, Balanos, Dyobouniotes, Alivisatos, Stephanides, Strinopoulos—to assure one of its value. Dyobouniotes summarizes in a masterly fashion in twenty pages the Church's dogmatic system; Strinopoulos in the longest chapter, pp. 114–160, treats of the relation of Orthodoxy to other churches in a manner to which the reviewer knows of no parallel; but all give an excellent view of the past and present of the Church, with some attempt to look into its future. The one criticism that might be made is that the work appears to have been written with a Protestant group of readers in mind; consequently hostility to Rome is strongly expressed and the various subjects are presented in a way which would make them most acceptable to the Protestant world. This does not mean that the characteristic teaching of Orthodoxy is diluted; the rejection of the *Filioque*, e.g., is strongly expressed: "through the Son" may only be used in reference to the Economic Trinity, not the Essential (p. 59).

F. H. H.

The Life and Work of William Gilpin. By William D. Templeton. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1939, pp. 336. Paper, \$3.00.

This is Volume 23, numbers 3 and 4 of "Illinois Studies in Language and Literature." These studies are monographs in linguistics and literature and related studies in the history of culture and ideas and include learned disquisitions on a vast variety of subjects most of them remote from the great highways of knowledge.

William Gilpin Vicar of Boldre and Master of the Picturesque was a person of renown in the eighteenth century with an amazing range of interests and accomplishments. He was at once theologian, biographer, artist, moralist, educator, traveller, social worker. His name suggests at once that even more famous if fictitious bearer of the name, the hero of Cowper's "diverting history"—John of the galloping runaway horse; and it is pleasant to learn that "after the publication of Cowper's classic (1782), the poet, in making the acquaintance of the Vicar of Boldre, expressed regret for having used the name so unceremoniously."

This monograph covers 336 pages of superb scholarship and includes a most extensive bibliography besides an adequate index. The type is clear, the illustrations excellent.

To be sure few will be tempted to pay three dollars for this paper bound biography, for its particular allure must perforce be limited to special students of eighteenth century culture.

G. C. S.

Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, Vol. XIV. *Causality in Current Philosophy*. Charles A. Hart, Editor. The Catholic University of America, 1939, pp. 228. \$1.50.

This book is made up of a collection of papers and addresses presented at the meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in December 1938. The concept of causality is examined not only from the metaphysical point of view but from the point of view of biological science and psychology, and as it appears in ethics and political philosophy and in the history of philosophy.

A number of leaders in Roman Catholic thinking, both men and women, took part in the discussion. If any proof were needed, this book gives ample proof of the fact that philosophy in the Roman Catholic Church not only has its roots in the past but is very much alive to what is going on in the world of thought to-day.

C. L. S.

Religious Education

Handbook of Christian Teaching. Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury and J. Scott Lidgett. London: The Sheldon Press, 1939, pp. xxvii + 536. \$1.50.

This is a reference book on the Bible and on Christian teaching prepared by a group of English clergymen representing both the Church of England and the Free Churches. It is in the form of comments of one or two paragraphs in length, first on various topics connected with the Bible in general and with the Hebrew religion, then book by book with the several books of the Old and New Testaments. Some excellent material about prayer and the Christian life is included in connection with the teaching of Jesus. The book is not meant to be a one volume Bible commentary; it is rather a collection of notes on a number of biblical subjects calculated to provide teachers with a background that will help them to teach more effectively. The book was designed specifically to be used with various syllabi approved for use in schools in England, but it is a book that will prove exceedingly useful to teachers anywhere who are working with the Bible and to others who want to deepen their knowledge of the Bible and the Christian religion.

C. L. S.

Education for Christian Marriage. Edited by A. S. Nash. New York, Macmillan, 1939, pp. xvi + 304. \$2.50.

Many excellent "marriage manuals" are now available, each stressing some particular aspect of the problem. In this one an attempt is made to cover all

important aspects by assigning fifteen topics to about a dozen specialists in Biblical exposition, systematic theology, sociology, medicine, law and religious education. As a result rather too much has been essayed; not only are the essays too compressed but there is a considerable amount of needless repetition.

B. S. E.

The Devotional Use of the Bible. By Peter Green. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. viii + 86. \$.60.

An excellent handbook for anyone interested in learning what the Bible really is and desirous of studying it systematically. It is an admirable manual for a Bible Class. There are six chapters: Why Should We Read the Bible? What is the Bible? How to Read the Bible Historically; Simple Methods for the Devotional Use of Holy Scripture; Devotional Study of the Bible; The Literary Study of the Bible.

The book abounds with practical suggestions and its personal references and illustrations enhance greatly its value as a stimulating guide.

P. S. K.

Die Bergpredigt und die Gleichnisse Jesu im Unterricht. By Erwin Wissman. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939, pp. x + 106. RM. 2.60.

For the "religious instruction" required in the German schools we have no precise parallel and so no parallel for the rather solid works published for such instruction. Mr. Wissman's book appears to be intended for use with a class of boys about fourteen years old, who would devote close attention to the text in the expectation of a stiff examination. Yet every effort is made to relate the material to modern conditions; and these are viewed broadly, with little apparent concern for the restrictions in contemporary Germany.

B. S. E.

The Old Testament and You. By Mary Chapin White. Louisville, Kentucky: The Cloister Press, 1939. Pupil's Work Book, pp. 107. \$.60. Teacher's Guide, pp. 27. \$.20.

This course on the Old Testament designed for seventh grade children fills a gap in our church school lesson material. There are at least two Old Testament work books published by the Sunday School Boards of other churches but Miss White's book provides suggestions for relating the Old Testament material to the child's everyday experience and everyday problems in a way that these other books do not. The material is well adjusted to the level of the children for whom the book is intended, but Miss White has a thoroughly modern point of view with regard to the Old Testament and children who take this course will get a foundation of Old Testament knowledge which will not have to be torn down and built up again when they come up against Old Testament criticism later on.

The Teacher's Guide is a book of only 36 pages but it contains some valuable suggestions for using work books in general and this work book in particular. There is a good short bibliography and a list of publishers of prints which can be used to illustrate the lessons in the course. This is by far the best Old

Testament course available for the grades below high school. Any church school that is not making use of it is missing a real opportunity. C. L. S.

Christian Living in Our Community. By Mary Fish Jaynes. Louisville: The Cloister Press, 1939, Teacher's Book, \$.90, Pupils' Reader, \$.60.

This course on community relationships is designed to enable the child to relate his judgments about right and wrong in matters of everyday life to the teaching of Our Lord and the teaching of the Church. The work of the course is divided into three units, one on following Jesus in our homes and neighborhoods, another on following Jesus in world relationships and a third on the Christian world community. The teacher's book has many suggestions for class discussions and class activities and the pupil's reader contains some excellent stories to be used as part of the material for the course. It is designed for fifth grade pupils but could be used effectively with pupils on the sixth or even the seventh grade level.

It is a course which would require some time and thought on the part of the teacher in preparation and it presupposes a certain amount of familiarity with teaching procedure but this is no criticism of the course. It is hard to see how our church schools can ever be really effective until our church school teachers, to say nothing of the clergy, are willing to devote time and energy to the task commensurate with its importance, and to make the preparation which is required by a course of this kind. C. L. S.

Snowden's Sunday School Lessons, 1940. By Earl Douglass. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. xi + 337. \$1.50.

The International Sunday School Lessons have had an honorable history and have met and still meet the needs of many Sunday Schools. The trend in religious education in recent years has been away from lesson material as strictly "Bible centered" as this is, but with good teaching and an earnest attempt to link up the material with the pupils' every day problems such a course can still be a useful instrument in developing Christian character.

A book to help teachers to use the International Sunday School Lessons in this way would be of real value but Dr. Douglass's book seems hardly to meet this need. His hints to the teachers are largely confined to interpretations of the meaning of the text. There is very little illustrative material in spite of the statement on the wrapper of the book and very few suggestions for the practical application of the lessons. If one were going to teach the International Sunday School Lessons and to do it effectively it would seem to this reviewer that one would not get much help from this book. C. L. S.